

ORIGINAL

MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF ROCKVILLE

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

MEETING NO. 07-15

WORKSESSION ON THE DRAFT ROCKVILLE'S PIKE PLAN FOR  
THE CITY OF ROCKVILLE

Thursday, February 12, 2015

1 PARTICIPANTS:

2 Mayor and Council:

3 BRIDGET DONNELL NEWTON, Mayor

4 BERYL L. FEINBERG, Councilmember

5 TOM MOORE, Councilmember

6 VIRGINIA D. ONLEY, Councilmember

7 JULIE PALAKOVICH CARR, Councilmember

8 Staff:

9 BARBARA MATTHEWS, City Manager

10 DEBRA DANIEL, City Attorney

11 CLARK LARSON, Planning GIS Specialist

12 SARA TAYLOR-FERRELL, Acting City  
13 Clerk/Treasurer

14 Additional Staff:

15 SUSAN SWIFT  
16 Director of Community Planning &  
Development Services

17 CRAIG SIMONEAU  
18 Director of Public Works

19 ANDREW GUNNING  
Assistant Director, Dept. of Community  
20 Planning and Development Services

21 CYNTHIA KEBBA  
Planner III

22



1 PARTICIPANTS (CONT'D) :

2 DAVID LEVY  
3 Chief Long Range Planner & Redevelopment

4 EMAD ELSHAFEI  
5 Chief of Traffic and Transportation

6

7 \* \* \* \* \*

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MAYOR NEWTON: Welcome. This is not a  
3 regular Mayor and Council Meeting, but it is a  
4 Thursday night in Rockville, and so we to have a  
5 meeting. This is a work session with the Mayor  
6 and Council and staff. Many of us thought it was  
7 a work session with the Mayor and Council and the  
8 Planning Commission, but we are now all straight  
9 on that. I was confused as well as, I think, all  
10 of us, but this is good, and so we're happy to be  
11 here. Thank you.

12 Oh, can I say one more thing? We also  
13 have to say happy birthday to David Levy.

14 (Laughter) I learned that today's his birthday.

15 (Applause) Thank you for sharing it with us.

16 MR. LEVY: Listen to that. Thank you,  
17 Mayor Newton. (Laughter) I didn't say that.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: No, you didn't tell me.

19 MR. LEVY: Good evening. As you know,  
20 I'm David Levy, Chief of Long Range Planning  
21 within the Department of Community Planning and  
22 Development Services. However, there's lots of

1 other staff here to support your discussion of the  
2 Rockville Pike Plan. They include from CPDS,  
3 Susan Swift, our director; Andrew Gunning,  
4 assistant director, who's been (inaudible) on many  
5 of the interactions with staff on Bus Rapid  
6 Transit (inaudible) with the county; Cindy Kebba  
7 who's been project manager on the Pike Plan; Craig  
8 Simoneau, who's been with us the whole way with  
9 the planning process, director of public works,  
10 and also was on the Rapid Transit Task Force; Emad  
11 Elshafei, chief of traffic and transportation; he  
12 has been with us every step as well. We have  
13 Clark at the controls who you may not see, but  
14 many, if not all, of the drawings that you've  
15 looked, the ones that have helped to clarify were  
16 Clark. (Laughter) The ones that didn't were not  
17 Clark. (Laughter) Of course, we have other staff  
18 who will help as needed.

19 Our job as staff will be to facilitate,  
20 to the extent you wish to, reaching a  
21 point-of-view regarding the plan. As a reminder,  
22 the plan is still officially with the Planning

1 Commission. They haven't formally transmitted it,  
2 but they defer to your status as the Mayor and  
3 Council because they wanted to hear your  
4 point-of-view before they did formally transmit  
5 it.

6           Once they receive your comments, they'll  
7 review and make their decisions about what to  
8 formally recommend in the updated plan. I know  
9 you've all mentioned the importance of interacting  
10 with them before you do that, and so we have a  
11 scheduled joint meeting with you and the Planning  
12 Commission at the next Planning Commission  
13 meeting, which is February 25th. I think you all  
14 have that on your calendar.

15           Mr. Gunning and I discussed that with  
16 the Planning Commission last night, so they're  
17 looking forward to that and probably, perhaps,  
18 even watching to see what goes on. But we've  
19 committed to them that we will give some feedback  
20 to them on the results of this on February 23rd in  
21 advance of that meeting.

22           In a sense, what you're really

1 discussing at this point, our interpretation is  
2 what you want to say to the Planning Commission.  
3 As such, staff has always viewed this as  
4 potentially the work product of all this work is a  
5 memorandum with your views, whatever they are.  
6 Whatever your views are in the big picture and  
7 whatever decisions you make at whatever level, big  
8 picture, small picture, we'll help you facilitate  
9 getting your point-of-view to them. We would  
10 bring you a draft of that, and you would review  
11 it, tell us how we messed up, and fix it and all  
12 that good stuff.

13 The two topics that are on the agenda  
14 that we did on our staff report are ones that  
15 received significant testimony from the public and  
16 comments from you. There are obviously other  
17 topics that we did not write on to this agenda  
18 which received significant testimony such as Fleet  
19 Street and some other topics as well. I wanted to  
20 call out that this discussion not having those  
21 does not mean that those won't be discussed.

22 But the two that are here are the cross



1 section of Rockville Pike -- we are of the opinion  
2 that the Pike is an important part of the Pike  
3 Plan -- and building heights and the amount of  
4 development and your view on building height.  
5 That's what we have started with. We distributed  
6 a schedule with that to everybody beforehand, so I  
7 think we're good with that. We structured it to  
8 start with the Pike.

9 We prepared a packet of information.  
10 I'll just quickly go through it so that everybody  
11 knows what's there, and the public can follow  
12 along as well. Attached, there's a memorandum.  
13 It wouldn't be a meeting if there's no memorandum.  
14 It lays out much of what I just said.

15 Attachment A lists a set of questions  
16 that we developed. Very straightforward questions  
17 based on what the public have said and what you  
18 have said. Obviously if you have other questions,  
19 other approaches, the Mayor and Council, that  
20 these are the ones that we developed, and we would  
21 recommend considering them.

22 Now our recommendation, if you're so

1 inclined, is to actually vote on it to decide what  
2 you want if you feel like you've reached that  
3 comfort level. Nothing is final. Nothing is  
4 final, in our view, until you have a memorandum  
5 that you're sending. Here is what we want to put  
6 in our draft communication to the Planning  
7 Commission, and then we'll see whether that all  
8 works together. That's our view of it. You may  
9 have a different one, but that's what we're  
10 thinking might work.

11 As you've heard and read, there's been a  
12 fair amount of testimony regarding the overall  
13 width of the Pike. Obviously we heard it; you all  
14 heard it -- the cross-section of the Pike. Not  
15 all, but most of it has been concerned that it's  
16 too wide. We've brought some options forward that  
17 reflect the different kinds of considerations that  
18 are in the questions, and we're hoping that can  
19 help to isolate certain issues if that helps you  
20 do so.

21 Attachment B presents the options in a  
22 manner that's comparable. It's not exactly in the

1 same format as in the draft plan. It's on this  
2 sheet here, blown up. We're going to point to it  
3 there. Clark is going to put it on the screen  
4 when it comes up so the public gets a chance to  
5 see it too. It's a little harder to see it in  
6 this format, so we're going to try to do it  
7 three-way.

8 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

9 MR. LEVY: And four-way because you have  
10 your packets.

11 Attachment C is a memorandum developed  
12 by Ms. Kebba that provides a bit of background on  
13 the access roads, where they come from, because  
14 obviously that is a key component of the  
15 discussion. We've received testimony about that.

16 Attachments D and E are on the topic of  
17 building heights, and we'll get to that when we  
18 get to that.

19 Any comments before I get started? I  
20 was going to go and get started looking at stuff  
21 here.

22 MAYOR NEWTON: Sure.



1                   MR. LEVY: Great. All right. Just to  
2 start as a reminder to reorient ourselves, this is  
3 -- now, I know you can't see it very well there  
4 and I'm not going to talk from this so much --  
5 this is what's in the Planning Commission June  
6 2014 draft plan. It's the cross section for the  
7 Pike. I'm going to walk through it so you can  
8 track it, and Cindy is going to show the features  
9 that are in your packet to help you understand.  
10 But the public, if you're looking at it, this is  
11 what you see.

12                   Obviously the key component of this is a  
13 multi-way boulevard. It's a (inaudible) of a  
14 multi-way boulevard whose feature is having the  
15 through traffic go in the middle and the local --  
16 oh, thank you. I apologize. Error number one.  
17 Okay. Here's the Pike as in the current Planning  
18 Commission draft.

19                   A major feature: It's recommended as a  
20 multi-way boulevard. Through traffic is in the  
21 center; local traffic is in the access roads. A  
22 key feature is, obviously, in the center. The

1 Planning Commission elected to provide dedicated  
2 lanes for Bus Rapid Transit in the center. It  
3 provides a two-way, dedicated cycle track  
4 (inaudible) two- way bicycle lanes on both sides.

5 It provides one-way driving in the  
6 service lane. If we're looking north, this is the  
7 east side, so the railroad tracks would be over  
8 there. One-way driving with one lane of parking.  
9 That provides for wider sidewalks than anything  
10 that's out there right now. Ten feet for -- and  
11 actually you can see this a little bit better in  
12 the blow-up of it. Ten feet of clear of walking  
13 space, ten feet of what's called 'amenity zone'.  
14 For those in the town square know that's where the  
15 elder seating is, that's where the trees are,  
16 that's where the signage is. This is the blow-up  
17 of what the access roads have in the proposal.

18 To pull it out in the new format, and  
19 only for comparison purposes with the other ones  
20 so we can see them all in comparison, the total is  
21 252 feet measured from building face to building  
22 face. The state right-of-way is currently -- that

1 means the part of the road that's owned by the  
2 state, that's the main driving, is 120 feet right  
3 now. It would almost certainly need to expand if  
4 any of the RT came because it wouldn't be wide  
5 enough to have that plus sidewalks. In White  
6 Flint, it's 30, 40 feet wider, the state  
7 right-of-way, than what we have now.

8 One of the goals from early on in the  
9 Pike process, including from the consultants long  
10 ago, was to narrow the width of the Pike because  
11 the 1989 plan, as compared to this 252  
12 building-to-building distance, is 270. The  
13 consultants actually recommended 200.5 feet, to be  
14 precise. Their early recommendation was a  
15 significant narrowing. That recommendation did  
16 not have Bus Rapid Transit, dedicated lanes. It  
17 did not have two-way bicycle lanes. Those were  
18 the significant components that, when added back  
19 in, brought -- there were other minor adjustments,  
20 but brought the 200.5 out to 252. Did I get it  
21 right, Emad?

22 MR. ELSHAFEI: Yes.

1                   MR. LEVY: Okay, good. It's a narrowing  
2 of 18 feet as compared to the 1989 plan, as  
3 compared to 69.5 feet which the consultant  
4 initially recommended.

5                   Obviously there are a lot of features  
6 here. We thought it would be valuable to start  
7 with a really central question -- and that's a  
8 pun, center, metaphorically and all that -- Bus  
9 Rapid Transit.

10                  In the questions that we distributed,  
11 the question is should Bus Rapid Transit be a  
12 feature of the Rockville Pike Plan? One way to  
13 think about it is obviously the City of Rockville  
14 isn't doing Bus Rapid Transit. We don't run  
15 transit. The question from a planning  
16 point-of-view is: What should Rockville's  
17 position be with respect to planning for there to  
18 be dedicated lanes on Rockville Pike for transit?  
19 Should there be dedicated lanes? That cascades to  
20 a lot of things.

21                  If no, then it's narrower. If yes, we  
22 have to accommodate it. The question, should you



1 choose to consider it, is: Do you wish to keep  
2 the Planning Commission's recommendation, which is  
3 to reserve dedicated lanes for Bus Rapid Transit?

4 MAYOR NEWTON: Anybody want to weigh in?  
5 Councilmember Moore?

6 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor. I  
7 guess one question that is not just whether to  
8 dedicate it, but where to put them. One of the  
9 options is to put them on the sides, and it's  
10 interesting that the cross section is a little  
11 more narrow when the bus lanes are on the sides.  
12 Could you talk to us a little bit about that and  
13 the pros and cons and just what the lay of land is  
14 on that?

15 MR. LEVY: Sure, and I think Mr.  
16 Simoneau and Mr. Elshafei can also weigh in. But  
17 when you put them on the sides you can put the  
18 stops --

19 MR. MOORE: Right.

20 MR. LEVY: -- on the sides, and you  
21 don't need dedicated space. When you put them in  
22 the middle, you don't need two lanes. You need,

1 essentially, three lanes because you need to have  
2 a place for an ADA-width stop, which, by the way,  
3 gets shared with the turn lane. The net addition  
4 of BRT -- you add it all up, and it's about 50  
5 feet. But since it's sharing with the turn lane,  
6 it's about 35 feet total. But it's still three  
7 lanes worth. When you put it there, you're  
8 removing some of the width that goes for the -- is  
9 there anything else that's part of it?

10 MR. ELSHAFEI: No. Just to clarify,  
11 when you have the bus in the middle you want to  
12 put the bus station in the middle. We have to  
13 have a wide median in the middle out from the Pike  
14 to be able to accommodate the bus station for the  
15 BRT. But if you have that on the side, we already  
16 have in the plan or we have to have in the plan a  
17 bus stop on the side because that's the  
18 (inaudible) --

19 MR. MOORE: Right.

20 MR. ELSHAFEI: -- other buses will be  
21 using it. It's kind of like you are using the big  
22 median on the sides either way, but if you put the

1 bus in the middle you have to put your station in  
2 the middle, which is a big median. That's the  
3 difference between the 252 and the 244.

4 MAYOR NEWTON: Is that 241 --

5 MR. MOORE: But what we've heard is that  
6 the county has done some planning on this as well  
7 and that their thought is that it would go down  
8 the center. Why they arrived at that conclusion,  
9 why they think that's better; are there technical  
10 reasons why? Are they faster if they go down the  
11 middle?

12 MR. SIMONEAU: Some of the reasons that  
13 we've heard and we've stated is when they are in  
14 the right lanes there are more conflicts with  
15 turning movements, especially with the access  
16 lanes and everything else. There's a lot going on  
17 there. They feel it's safer in the center.

18 A second thing that we've been trying to  
19 advocate for is you're going to have a wide  
20 Rockville Pike cross- section no matter what you  
21 do here, and pedestrian crossing is going to be --  
22 people are going to be concerned with making it

1 across there.

2 If you put the BRT in the middle you  
3 have the option now to have a split-phase  
4 crossing, which means you can cross in two cycles  
5 and you have a center refuge area built-in for  
6 pedestrians who, when they come off the BRT, will  
7 have to stop there, and they can wait there until  
8 they get the pedestrian signal to cross. But  
9 someone crossing all the way from the extremes can  
10 also do that if they don't make it or you can  
11 actually split the cycle to do two crossings  
12 rather than one.

13 MR. MOORE: I guess anybody riding the  
14 bus only ever has to go halfway across the road.

15 MR. SIMONEAU: Unless they do something  
16 in error and have to double back, yes.

17 MR. MOORE: Well, yes. (Laughter)

18 MR. SIMONEAU: Lost.

19 MR. LEVY: In the White Flint Sector  
20 Plan by the way -- the approved White Flint Sector  
21 Plan had two options: One of them had transit in  
22 the center, and one of them had transit --



1 semi-dedicated lanes on the outside. That's the  
2 approved White Flint Sector Plan as shown.  
3 Actually, one of the options we have here just  
4 shows that for consideration; I believe that's  
5 option 8. You're adding a lane also, but you're  
6 adding it on the sides as opposed to the middle.  
7 It does widen it either way, just not quite as  
8 much.

9 MR. SIMONEAU: On the turns I just felt  
10 that the left turns crossing the center are easier  
11 to control because they're controlled movements at  
12 the light, whereas right turns are more difficult  
13 because people are turning right on red. You also  
14 have the bicycle tracks going and the bike lanes  
15 going there. They'll be making more movements in  
16 front of a BRT if it was on the side also.

17 MR. MOORE: Is it your assessment as  
18 well that the center is safer?

19 MR. SIMONEAU: That was our assessment.  
20 That was our recommendation to the Planning  
21 Commission, and I think that helped guide them,  
22 amongst other reasons, why it was in the center in

1 addition to being advocated by -- it seems like  
2 it's being advocated by most other outside people,  
3 Montgomery County, and others --

4 MR. MOORE: Okay.

5 MR. SIMONEAU: -- for the center  
6 running.

7 MR. MOORE: Thank you. That's very  
8 helpful. Thank you.

9 MR. ELSHAFEI: There is also less  
10 conflict for the middle. If the BRT is running in  
11 the middle, there is less conflict. The only  
12 thing conflicting you would have would be the  
13 traffic signal when people are making a left or  
14 crossing.

15 MR. MOORE: Mm-hmm.

16 MR. ELSHAFEI: But on the side, again,  
17 if we keep it totally for BRT it's one thing, but  
18 might share (inaudible) for example, or the --  
19 well, not for buses. Also, it depends on what we  
20 are going to do about people in the Pike who want  
21 to get in the access roads or who want to access  
22 the side, and that would be the BRT in the way.

1 MR. MOORE: Gotcha.

2 MR. LEVY: Or any right turn that they  
3 would want to make it.

4 MR. SIMONEAU: That movement is not  
5 insignificant because we've heard from the public  
6 during the Planning Commission process that you  
7 can't just let the public into those access lanes  
8 at the intersections. That there should be,  
9 during the longer blocks, an occasional break in  
10 there to allow people into those lanes.

11 MR. LEVY: Right.

12 MR. SIMONEAU: That is a consideration.  
13 The more of those you have, if the BRT's running  
14 in there, the more conflict you're going to have  
15 with crossing all that. It gets a little bit  
16 hairier, if you would.

17 MR. MOORE: Okay. Good, thank you.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: I think this brings up  
19 the whole big question of -- we haven't really  
20 talked about is the vision, and I did tell David  
21 today some of my concerns about this whole thing.  
22 But I feel like we're putting the cart before the

1 horse because we really should be doing the  
2 comprehensive master plan, and then we should be  
3 doing the Rockville Pike Plan, and then we should  
4 be doing all of that based on the APFO.

5 I'm not saying that the APFO discussion  
6 is over, by the way, but I'm concerned -- we're  
7 talking about access roads. I'm not really sure  
8 if we have the right to have the access roads  
9 based on some of the testimony we've heard  
10 recently, and we received another letter this week  
11 that was signed by many, many property owners  
12 along the Pike.

13 We've spent how many years? Seven  
14 years, millions of dollars talking about a plan  
15 that's only 2 miles out of the entire Rockville  
16 Pike in the city, and I just wonder.

17 MR. LEVY: Wonder whether we should be  
18 working on a plan at all?

19 MAYOR NEWTON: I wonder whether we have  
20 put the cart before the horse and we should be  
21 concentrating on doing the comprehensive master  
22 plan and deciding what we want to do, what we want



1 to make Rockville.

2 For instance, the BRT: Great sounding,  
3 and in some areas very, very necessary, but in  
4 Rockville we have three metro stations. Maybe  
5 what we really need is something that's more local  
6 that gets people from the metro station to the  
7 places they want to go on the Pike.

8 This is our golden mile. This is our  
9 potential retail mecca along with Town Center.  
10 But I really think that the BRT as planned is not  
11 going to stop as often as people are going to want  
12 to get on and off. One of things that we've heard  
13 in the roundtable that we had with all of the  
14 jurisdictions -- the county, Gaithersburg, and the  
15 state -- was that what works for Rockville doesn't  
16 necessarily have to be what Gaithersburg and vice  
17 versa.

18 The Pike is not going to be this wide as  
19 this proposed once you get to Town Center.  
20 Gaithersburg is in no way making it that wide  
21 where they are, and I don't believe White Flint's  
22 going to make it that wide. Are we creating a

1 bottleneck by talking about a 12-lane highway in  
2 this 2-mile stretch when it's not going to be that  
3 wide north or south?

4           Since I'm going forward with everything,  
5 the other thing I worry about is we don't really  
6 want people to drive through Rockville. We want  
7 people to come to Rockville and be here to shop  
8 and visit the restaurants and all those things.  
9 If we create a highway by moving the traffic  
10 that's going to be stopping and starting and  
11 turning in and out, we move them to the sides,  
12 then all 355 is going to be is another 270.

13           Rockville is already divided by a  
14 12-lane 270 by the Metro and the MARC train. I  
15 don't think we want another divider right in the  
16 middle.

17           Those are all the things that I think  
18 about when I'm trying to think how best do we plan  
19 for the next 40 years, and maybe it's going to be  
20 longer than that probably. But those are the  
21 things that I struggle with.

22           I think the biggest question, even if we

1     don't stop all this and start talking about the  
2     comprehensive master plan, is: Do we really have  
3     the right to talk about those access roads on the  
4     side or is that property that we would then have  
5     to spend millions and millions of dollars putting  
6     a road on not just to build a road, but to acquire  
7     the rights to that property. I'm not sure, if  
8     that were in our budget purview, that's what we  
9     would do with that money. Sir?

10                 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor.  
11     That's a good question. I think the development  
12     community, the property owners along that stretch,  
13     have been in communication with all of us. They  
14     have made their position clear that they would  
15     prefer to build on all this land rather than have  
16     access lanes there. They've been unambiguous  
17     about that position.

18                 They have raised the question about the  
19     status of the easements that are there and what  
20     would happen going forward. I think this is an  
21     excellent opportunity to clear that up.

22                 If you could give us a minute just --

1     what's an easement? How do we get them? If  
2     somebody wants to redevelop their property, do we  
3     get more of them? Do we have to buy that land?  
4     Is this a big cash out? Under what circumstances  
5     would the city have to put out a lot of cash?  
6     It's a good concern, but I think there is some  
7     real answers to those questions.

8                 MR. LEVY: I'm going to do the best I  
9     can. I'm going to rely on some others if they can  
10    help me out on this.

11                Since the 1960s, the city has been  
12    getting easements for these service drives, and  
13    most of them say some version of -- on the plaque  
14    itself says 'owner's dedication' and then it shows  
15    a 25 to 30-foot area and it says 'service drive  
16    easement,' 'service lane easement.' Sometimes it  
17    says 'dedicated for public use.' Sometimes it says  
18    'service drive for ingress egress.' There are  
19    about 40 of them that have been collected over the  
20    last 49 years, since 1966.

21                An easement can be many different  
22    things. I don't know if you want to define an



1       easement, Craig?

2                   MR. SIMONEAU: I'll take a stab at it  
3       since we're the ones who manage most easements.

4                   An easement is a property owner's giving  
5       the right to somebody else to do something on the  
6       land. The most common is when it's dedicated to  
7       public use, and most of our rights-of-way in the  
8       City Rockville are dedicated to public use. It is  
9       a very, very liberal easement given to the city.

10                  We basically do everything but own the  
11       land. We usually do not own our right-of-way  
12       in-fee, although you can own your right-of-way  
13       in-fee. It can be a fee, title, piece of land  
14       that has been purchased, and very occasionally we  
15       have that.

16                  Most of our right-of-ways are dedicated  
17       to public use. That means we have absolute  
18       authority to regulate what goes on and to allocate  
19       who uses it, and that is the role I serve to do  
20       that. I sign permits in there. I tell the  
21       utility companies where they can be and where they  
22       can't be. I issue them permits to be there, and

1 we regulate that.

2 When we no longer need it, we go through  
3 an abandonment process. The abandonment process  
4 is very specific in the state and basically says  
5 it goes back to whom it came. If that is not  
6 clear or it came from the adjoining property  
7 owners, it's abandoned equally amongst the  
8 adjoining property owners. That is the highest  
9 form, and then you go from there and you go to  
10 other easements.

11 Typically in utilities we have specific  
12 utility easements. It only gives us the right to  
13 use that land for the stated purpose, and when a  
14 utility (inaudible) is only for -- it says a sewer  
15 easement, it's only for a sewer line. We can't  
16 put other things in that area, and the property  
17 owner has residual rights to use the land as long  
18 as it's not inconsistent with what the easement is  
19 stated for.

20 Sometimes we have public access  
21 easements. A lot of sidewalks, like the sidewalks  
22 in Town Square as an example, are not in the

1 right-of-way, and we don't totally control them,  
2 but we have a public access easement over it.  
3 That means the public has the right to use it, and  
4 they can't do certain things with that sidewalk  
5 that would deny the public's use to it. We help  
6 control to make sure that the public's access is  
7 maintained even though it's a lesser form of  
8 easement than if we had it as right-of-way or even  
9 an easement that we constructed the road in.

10               There's various forms of them. Whenever  
11 you hear 'dedicated to public use,' whenever you  
12 hear things like that, that is the highest form.  
13 That's like right-of-way. When you hear 'a public  
14 access easement,' that means we can use it but  
15 only for access. We can't use it more liberally.  
16 It's almost comparable, but perhaps a little more.  
17 Then you have others ones that when it says 'for  
18 ingress and egress' and it doesn't say public,  
19 then you have to go on the line and see what else  
20 was there. For example, it may have been in the  
21 zoning requirement that they were to require an  
22 access lane, they were required to build it, they

1     were required to maintain it, and then it might  
2     not be the public's ability to go and do that.

3             However, whatever is there, if there is  
4     an existing easement it makes it easier for us to  
5     acquire if we don't already have that right  
6     because the land is already set aside to do it.  
7     They don't have a right to build on it already.  
8     The price of that land is priced less because it  
9     already has an existing easement on it. The value  
10    is less. They can't build a building on it. It  
11    becomes easier to acquire if we don't have that  
12    right.

13            Usually when you do a project like this,  
14    there's always acquisition that has to go on. As  
15    you go forward, as we get projects dedicated, they  
16    can't build on that anyway. The value of it is  
17    not there, so a lot of times they dedicate it to  
18    us when they do a redevelopment project. It gets  
19    dedicated to us.

20            MR. MOORE: Okay. It's my understanding  
21    that the easements that we have, a lot of them  
22    were dedications when the properties were



1       redeveloped.

2                   MR. SIMONEAU:   Correct.   We obtained  
3       most of ours over time through that process.

4                   MR. MOORE:   We didn't pay cash for them?  
5       It was just -- we said, look --

6                   MR. SIMONEAU:   That's my understanding.

7                   MR. MOORE:   -- you've got your build-to  
8       line.

9                   MR. SIMONEAU:   Right.

10                  MR. MOORE:   You're within that. You  
11       can't build it anyway. You will dedicate it to  
12       us. In that part --

13                  MR. SIMONEAU:   They agreed to do that.  
14       They agreed to do that during the development  
15       process.

16                  MR. LEVY:   Just to clarify, not all of  
17       the space between the state right-of-way and the  
18       build-to line is an easement.

19                  MR. SIMONEAU:   Right.

20                  MR. LEVY:   Only 25 to 30 feet of that is  
21       an easement. There's another under the 1989 plan.  
22       There's 60 feet for the state right-of-way from

1 center line, then up to another 30 feet, so t hat  
2 makes 90 feet. Then there's another 45 feet --

3 MR. SIMONEAU: Right.

4 MR. LEVY: -- that is not permitted to  
5 have building on it. Only that first 25 to 30  
6 feet, depending on the easement, would be an  
7 easement.

8 MR. MOORE: But we would expect that  
9 process to continue. If anybody wants to  
10 redevelop anywhere along Rockville Pike, they  
11 cannot build within those build-to lines, and so  
12 they will either dedicate it to us -- ordinarily  
13 they would dedicate it to us if they wanted to  
14 redevelop; is that right?

15 MR. SIMONEAU: They cannot develop  
16 something that is not in concert with the master  
17 plan, and the current master plan sets out these  
18 easements and sets out an area for these roads and  
19 the build-to line. If they were to redevelop,  
20 basically there could not be a finding that it was  
21 consistent to the master plan if they plan to put  
22 a building on something that is already in the

1 master plan for an access road or something to  
2 that nature.

3 MR. MOORE: Okay.

4 MR. LEVY: It's happening right now at  
5 the (inaudible) first site. Actually, as part of  
6 the development, there are connections being made  
7 to the adjacent sites to more make the  
8 service-drive easement connect to north and south.

9 MR. MOORE: Okay.

10 MR. SIMONEAU: Similar to Marilyn  
11 Dawson. Right now the master plan shows Marilyn  
12 Dawson. We have specific boundaries, and those  
13 landowners in there, when they come in and  
14 develop, they cannot develop in that land because  
15 it would be inconsistent with the master plan.

16 MR. MOORE: Okay. Under what  
17 circumstances would we have to buy the land? When  
18 would we have to put out cash? There's concern  
19 that the city would have to put out large amounts  
20 of cash up and down those 2 miles. Under what  
21 circumstances would we have to do that?

22 MR. SIMONEAU: Where we don't already

1     have the right to do what we want to do. We would  
2     have to go through an acquisition process. We may  
3     need the acquisition process for an easement or  
4     the right-of-way to build the road or we may  
5     actually need it for temporary construction  
6     easements --

7                   MR. MOORE: Okay.

8                   MR. SIMONEAU: -- it's typically  
9     required also.

10                  MR. MOORE: Is it accurate to say that  
11     it's where we don't already have it and where  
12     nobody wants to redevelop because if somebody  
13     wants to redevelop we'll get it?

14                  MR. LEVY: It is accurate to say that,  
15     but it may be that -- we would not rule out that  
16     there would be some cost even in some of the areas  
17     -- it is not a highest-and- best-use cost as  
18     compared to if you could build on it or as  
19     compared to if there was no easement.

20                  MR. MOORE: Mm-hmm.

21                  MR. LEVY: But when an appraisal is  
22     done, then we would know.



1 MR. MOORE: Okay.

2 MR. SIMONEAU: It's he who gets there  
3 first. If the developer has not developed and  
4 doesn't have a plan and has not dedicated it, then  
5 we'll have to go through an acquisition process.  
6 If before we go and build it they have come in for  
7 a development plan and they have then dedicated  
8 it, then we will have it dedicated. Whatever is  
9 not already in dedication has to be obtained.

10 MR. MOORE: Okay.

11 MAYOR NEWTON: But is that the best use  
12 for the land; to build it for cars that -- this  
13 isn't the sixties. It's not the eighties. It's  
14 not even 2000. People are going away from cars,  
15 and we've had people sit here recently -- we all  
16 know millennials aren't buying cars. They'd  
17 rather do Uber or Metro or whatever.

18 What is the purpose of us acquiring that  
19 land if really going forward we're going to be  
20 much more of a multimodal society than a car  
21 society? Would we be better served by giving that  
22 land back to the property owners and asking them

1 to do their public property in significant  
2 greenspace or something like that? Councilmember  
3 Moore?

4 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor.  
5 Actually, that's an interesting question for us to  
6 address. The question that you had already asked  
7 that I was interested in getting answered though  
8 was do we have the right to talk about the access  
9 roads.

10 Do we have the right to say, yes, access  
11 roads can go up and down these trenches? It  
12 sounds to me, from what the staff is saying, that  
13 the answer is yes. Not for every bit of it, but  
14 if anybody wants to redevelop we will be getting  
15 that more and more. If we put together a plan  
16 where people want to redevelop, then we'll be  
17 getting those dedications. Not whether we should  
18 do it, not whether it's the best idea, but whether  
19 we have the right to do it. I'm not hearing  
20 anything inconsistent --

21 MR. SIMONEAU: You have an absolute  
22 right. You are a public entity. You have

1 condemnation authority. Therefore, you are the  
2 entity that acts for the public good, and you make  
3 the determination what is for the public good and  
4 what is not for the public good. If you deem it  
5 for the public good, then you can go through a  
6 process, even if it's against the property owner's  
7 wishes, to obtain that for public good.

8 MAYOR NEWTON: But do you still have to  
9 pay when you take it under eminent domain? You  
10 do, right?

11 MR. SIMONEAU: Yes, yes. You have to  
12 pay fair market value.

13 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

14 MR. SIMONEAU: Right.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: If an acre currently is  
16 going for \$10 million, and even though there may  
17 be an easement on that and David's saying we could  
18 get it for less, how much less? We're certainly  
19 not going to get it for pennies on the dollar.

20 MS. SWIFT: Yes.

21 MR. LEVY: No, you will.

22 MS. SWIFT: Significantly less because

1     they can't build a building on these easements.

2     I've done this for many years, and they'll say, as  
3     they're laughing now, that it's worth more than we  
4     will say. That's part of the condemnation  
5     process, but --

6             MAYOR NEWTON: Actually, I think they're  
7     laughing with us.

8             MS. SWIFT: No, I know. (Laughter) I  
9     know that. But they cannot build a building on  
10    those that have easements on them now, so it's  
11    significantly less market value. Will we have to  
12    pay for it if we have to acquire even the  
13    easements? Yes, we would have to pay something if  
14    they weren't redeveloping.

15            We're not advocating for any of these.  
16    We're here to ask you what are your preferences.  
17    There is a balance, especially when talking about  
18    the access roads. That's really the biggest issue  
19    here is what kind of environment do you want to  
20    create versus the cost. Even if the state were to  
21    pay or the feds were to pay a portion of the  
22    access roads later, we've always said the city



1 would probably pay a part of it. Will we have to  
2 buy land? Yes. The question is depending on when  
3 this project goes forward, how much of the land,  
4 and what the timing is: Who's built; who hasn't  
5 built.

6 MR. LEVY: Yeah. The price ends up  
7 being based on the appraised value, which is based  
8 on highest and best use. If you can build a  
9 building on it, it's got a lot of value on it; if  
10 you can't, it's got less. However, there are  
11 other things that you can use land for.

12 If it takes out the parking that someone  
13 would use for their business there's a value to  
14 that, especially if it affects their business  
15 operations. Those are the kinds of considerations  
16 that go into the ultimate price. It's not just  
17 building or no building. It's does it affect the  
18 business, and obviously the property owner would  
19 make the best case that it does.

20 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

21 MR. LEVY: (inaudible)

22 MAYOR NEWTON: Councilmembers, I don't

1 want to (inaudible) back to you, so please just  
2 tell me if you (inaudible).

3 MR. SIMONEAU: One thing to consider  
4 here is there's a reason why we get dedication  
5 from property owners when they come and redevelop  
6 for two reasons: A lot of them think it's a good  
7 thing that we're redeveloping the road and  
8 providing an access to their property. But let's  
9 face it and let's be blunt: You have condemnation  
10 authority, and they know it.

11 They know in the end if you really want  
12 to build Marilyn Dawson, you really want to build  
13 access lanes, that you're going to be able to do  
14 that in the end. It's just a matter of how it  
15 unfolds, how much money is given, and how it  
16 happens because that's the authority you have.

17 A lot of times when they redevelop they  
18 get on the vision, and the vision's usually good  
19 for them because it provides that, but they  
20 dedicate it as they go along because they know  
21 it's going to serve them, and they know that that  
22 lane is going to be those roads in the end anyway.

1                   MAYOR NEWTON: Okay. Councilmember  
2     Moore?

3                   MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor.  
4     Something else that the mayor raised was what's  
5     the use of Rockville Pike: Whether we want people  
6     to be stopping on the way and shopping or whether  
7     we want people to be zipping straight through  
8     Rockville?

9                   Do we have an estimate of what that  
10    split is now? I get the impression that there's a  
11    lot of both. If we don't have numbers, is there a  
12    general thought of what role the Pike serves in  
13    the transportation network? Obviously 270 shoots  
14    people straight through at very high speeds. What  
15    is 355s purpose and function currently?

16                  MAYOR NEWTON: Emad?

17                  MR. ELSHAFEI: Everybody's looking at  
18    me, so I guess I have to say something.

19    (Laughter)

20                  MAYOR NEWTON: Or we can give you  
21    another cupcake.

22                  MR. ELSHAFEI: Obviously the 355 is a

1 state road and it's a major highway or a major  
2 arterial, to be accurate. It does not function  
3 like 270. 270 is obviously a highway to make  
4 people move from city to city. 355 has a  
5 different role.

6           However, if anybody is in Twinbrook and  
7 wants to go to Rockville (inaudible) Metro Station  
8 and they are on Rockville Pike, they are not going  
9 to go (inaudible) west and then go to 270 and then  
10 come back. There are a lot of people who just  
11 don't have another choice than being on Rockville  
12 Pike even though they do not really have business  
13 to do on the Pike. I think that's what this plan  
14 is trying to help.

15           If you are on Congressional Lane and you  
16 want to be able to go to Richard Montgomery High  
17 School, you don't have to get on the Pike and go  
18 and be with everybody else. You can actually get  
19 on Jefferson, which is an important street, in my  
20 opinion, in this plan, and then get there or  
21 Chapman if you get extended. Now everybody has no  
22 choice but sitting on Rockville Pike even if you



1     don't want to look at Best Buy or anybody. You  
2     just have to stay on it.

3             I cannot give you a percentage of how  
4     many people are just -- they have a purpose to be  
5     on the Pike or how many people are just going  
6     through the city of Rockville. It all depends on  
7     how far they are going.

8             MR. LEVY: Yeah.

9             MS. KEBBA: I also that that people who  
10    are commuting through Rockville often stop at one  
11    of the shopping centers. They do both often.

12            MR. MOORE: It's funny. One of the  
13    things that struck me about these cross-sections  
14    is that the heart of Rockville Pike stays the  
15    same. You'll have three lanes on each side, maybe  
16    you've got some bus in the middle, but you've got  
17    three lanes on each side of high-volume, high-  
18    traffic lanes.

19            It seems to me that what these plans are  
20    doing is actually adding so much more to get  
21    people to stop whether it's the wide sidewalks,  
22    the amenity areas, the bike lanes on both sides,

1 and all the breakers in there, and the access  
2 lanes which allow you to pull over, slow down, and  
3 stop at businesses.

4 It just seems like everything that's  
5 added on to what we have now enhances the local  
6 experience rather than the drive-through  
7 experience. It sounds like the three lanes in  
8 both directions are going to be largely the same,  
9 but all the local stopping will function better.

10 MAYOR NEWTON: But wouldn't that local  
11 stopping happen on the back lanes -- whatever you  
12 call the interior lanes, streets, that they're  
13 going to build? If you remember the (inaudible)  
14 plan, they had an interior street between the  
15 Metro and 355 --

16 MR. LEVY: Right.

17 MAYOR NEWTON: -- that could handle that  
18 kind of traffic that would be going through.

19 MR. MOORE: Yeah. The developers have  
20 given us beautiful pictures of what's going to go  
21 through there if we do what they want. Chapman is  
22 supposed to be another -- some local access in

1     there, but it shouldn't replace what we're trying  
2     to do with the Pike. If you would like make a  
3     proposal to build East Jefferson Street, I think  
4     we'll fill up this room the next time we talk  
5     about this because that's going through a lot of  
6     property that has a lot of other stuff on it, and  
7     we're not going to be doing that anytime soon.

8             It's --

9             MAYOR NEWTON: I wasn't making that  
10    proposal. I guess what I'm struggling with, Tom,  
11    is that we can't be all things to all people, and  
12    this road can't be all things. In it's current  
13    configuration it is trying to be both a highway  
14    and a commuter road and a local road and a  
15    shopping center mecca and a home. I don't know  
16    how it can do all those things and be successful.  
17    That's what I struggle with. I just think we need  
18    to be more intentional about what we want for  
19    Rockville, what we really want this road to be,  
20    and then go from there, which is why I go back to  
21    the comprehensive master plan. But that's what I  
22    worry about.

1 MR. LEVY: I think you stated it very  
2 well, Mayor Newton. I think everybody has taken a  
3 cut at how to address the multifunctionality of  
4 the road, which is people use it to go through,  
5 people use it to stop, people use it -- I'm  
6 plucking it out of memories, but the  
7 transportation consultants -- it's at about 50,000  
8 cars that go along the Pike.

9 MR. ELSHAFEI: I think 60.

10 MR. LEVY: Yeah, 50 to 60 that go along.  
11 If I'm recalling correctly, the Gladding Jackson  
12 folks said approximately half were going through  
13 and half were at least stopping once in it. They  
14 weren't necessarily going from within it to  
15 another place within it, but they were starting  
16 from outside going within, starting from inside  
17 going out, or doing that interior. Ballpark; I've  
18 had it in my head since then, haven't checked on  
19 it since the recession, that it's half and half  
20 going through and using it at least for a local  
21 use. Saturday, by the way, is a totally different  
22 story.



1 MAYOR NEWTON: Oh, right.

2 MR. LEVY: We think of this in terms of  
3 the commuters during the week, but I think a lot  
4 of us who don't use the Pike for a commute  
5 interact with it a lot on Saturdays more than any  
6 other time for shopping.

7 Saturday's a particularly interesting  
8 case because a higher percentage is local because  
9 you're going to a store. That's why you're going  
10 there. As a result, if I recall, the overall  
11 volume was lower, but the congestion was higher  
12 because there are just way more conflicts.  
13 Everything is a conflict. In the a.m. peak, 70  
14 percent are going south.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

16 MR. LEVY: Thirty percent are coming to  
17 the Rockville employment center or going north.  
18 Then in the p.m. it switches, although by the p.m.  
19 during the week the stores are open, so you get  
20 the conflict too.

21 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

22 MR. LEVY: Anyway, I guess that's my way

1 saying that it's serving both functions now. The  
2 proposal from the consultants, frankly the concept  
3 from 1989 and before, was that this was a way, the  
4 multiway boulevard with service lanes, to address  
5 that. This is the time to rethink it. That's  
6 been the prevailing wisdom.

7 It is both. It's probably going to be  
8 both. How do we manage an imperfect situation and  
9 make something that we feel good about?

10 MR. SIMONEAU: You mention Chapman,  
11 Mayor Newton. We've worked with the developers on  
12 Chapman as they've developed. We've adjusted  
13 Chapman, but one thing to note: If you live north  
14 of Rockville Pike there, you can't get to those  
15 businesses on Chapman. It does not continue  
16 through. In order to get on Chapman from the  
17 north, you have to go on Rockville Pike.

18 None of these alternates, except on the  
19 west side if we build through the golf course  
20 there, you can't get through. You still have to  
21 get on the Pike. No matter what we think of  
22 Rockville Pike, Rockville Pike is going to

1 continue to serve both needs. The question is how  
2 is it going to do it because it's a state road,  
3 and the state doesn't have roads that only serve  
4 local needs. By definition it's not a state road,  
5 and there's no real way you can get roads totally  
6 through parallel to totally alleviate that. It's  
7 going to continue to do that. It's a matter of how  
8 we do it.

9 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

10 MS. FEINBERG: One of the things that I  
11 think you just addressed and I saw as a benefit to  
12 this plan is when you talk about the Saturday  
13 users, the local shoppers, people in the right  
14 lane are sitting there often and looking for,  
15 where am I going, and they actually slow down  
16 traffic. Whereas if you have an access, they can  
17 go up the major center lanes, go into the access.  
18 If it's a new store or they're not sure of the  
19 address, it still lets those folks who want to  
20 travel a little faster -- not as a throughput like  
21 you would during the week necessarily, but if  
22 you're going a longer traveling on Rockville Pike.

1 That's where I saw the benefit of combining the  
2 benefits of both: Having the major lanes and then  
3 having the access.

4 MR. LEVY: Then what you do to follow-up  
5 on that is you reduce the number of curb cuts --

6 MS. FEINBERG: Absolutely.

7 MR. LEVY: -- in the -- you go into the  
8 service road, and so as part of the planning  
9 process and following up with the Planning  
10 Commission concepts with this, we counted how many  
11 we thought. We thought -- what was it? About a  
12 40 percent reduction --

13 MS. SWIFT: Quite a bit.

14 MR. LEVY: -- of the curb cuts because  
15 you would be getting the local uses from the  
16 access road.

17 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

18 MR. LEVY: That's a benefit from the  
19 traffic side as we view it.

20 MR. SIMONEAU: WE view two advantages:  
21 One is the through traffic will have an advantage  
22 because all those people in the right lanes making



1     those turns not knowing where they're going,  
2     slowing down -- it'll allow the traffic in the  
3     main lanes that are going through to function  
4     better, and it'll allow the local traffic to  
5     function better because they won't have to be  
6     scared about driving in a 40 mile an hour  
7     throughput and being lost trying to find a  
8     business. They get into that local lane, then  
9     they have an option to pull into the garage off  
10    the access lane because in a block you may have  
11    two businesses between the two buildings. You  
12    might have an access into their garage or they'll  
13    turn down the street and come in behind and access  
14    that way.

15               It separates that traffic, and the local  
16    experience gets a little bit better throughput as  
17    does the -- and that's the thought, at least.  
18    You're correct that it will take away room from  
19    developers to do that, so it's a matter of which  
20    do you value more and what do you think is the  
21    best use for the land.

22               MR. MOORE: Now one thing that struck me

1     though, and we've heard a lot of talk about just  
2     how wide this is and it's so wide and it's taking  
3     all this land away from developers and so forth.  
4     It's actually not. It is returning 9 feet to  
5     developers on each side. The 1989 plan had 270  
6     feet building face to building face, and the draft  
7     that the Planning Commission has recommended to us  
8     is 252 feet, which is 18 feet less. It's --

9             MAYOR NEWTON: But let's also remember  
10    that those plans were built at a time when cars  
11    were at a premium. Everyone had a car.

12            MR. MOORE: Right. But if the question  
13    is: Oh my god, this is so wide. How can you  
14    possibly think of doing something this wide? It  
15    is actually 9 feet less on each side than anything  
16    we've done for the last 26 years. There's a book,  
17    it's called If You Give a Mouse a Cookie. If you  
18    give a mouse a cookie, he's going to want a glass  
19    of milk. In this plan, we are giving the  
20    development community and the land owners along  
21    there an extra 9 feet that they don't have now. I  
22    think they are coming to us and saying, we would

1 actually like another 20 feet or so. But --

2 MAYOR NEWTON: I haven't actually --

3 MR. MOORE: -- this plan does pull back  
4 from what we've been doing as a city for the last  
5 26 years.

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, and 9 feet is  
7 probably the width of this expanse that we're  
8 sitting at today. I don't really think that's  
9 much.

10 What I'm talking about is not that the  
11 developers are coming to us and asking for land  
12 back. What I'm talking about is what is the best  
13 use. As David Levy said, is it better for us to  
14 have more greenspace? I mean, we're building a  
15 road not for the 1960s or '89. We're building a  
16 road for the 2050s. Maybe more because it's  
17 almost 2020.

18 What is the best use going forward? If  
19 these are going to be communities, if these are  
20 going to be neighborhoods where people live, don't  
21 we want to have significant greenspace? Don't we  
22 want to have places where people can actually

1 live? That's one thing we don't have a lot of in  
2 certain of our mixed residential areas. We don't  
3 have a lot of greenspace.

4 I'm just trying to juxtapose the worth  
5 of building roads going forward for the next 50  
6 years versus the greenspace that we might want for  
7 those 50 years.

8 MS. KEBBA: I would just say that when  
9 we talk about the access road, we're talking about  
10 this whole space in here. A good chunk of it is  
11 for bikes and pedestrians. It's one lane of car  
12 traffic through and one lane of car parking, but a  
13 good chunk of the 66 feet is really for  
14 pedestrians and bikes too. Just to make the point  
15 that it's not -- road doesn't necessarily mean --

16 MAYOR NEWTON: That's not greenspace.

17 MS. KEBBA: Some of it is. Some of it  
18 is a part of the sidewalk.

19 MAYOR NEWTON: No, it's not playground  
20 space.

21 MS. KEBBA: Right.

22 MAYOR NEWTON: You're not going to go



1 lay down (inaudible).

2 MS. KEBBA: It's pedestrian. It's  
3 (inaudible).

4 MR. LEVY: You're not going to put a  
5 playground on Rockville Pike. That is --

6 MS. KEBBA: Yeah.

7 MAYOR NEWTON: I'm not talking about  
8 that.

9 MS. KEBBA: I understand.

10 MAYOR NEWTON: I'm talking about an  
11 actual park.

12 MS. KEBBA: Right. That would be  
13 required by the plan too.

14 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, but --

15 MS. KEBBA: Fifteen percent of the land  
16 area.

17 MR. MOORE: Right.

18 MS. KEBBA: Yeah.

19 MR. MOORE: But not in some narrow strip  
20 all the way down Rockville Pike.

21 MS. SWIFT: Right.

22 MR. MOORE: I mean, that is not a good

1 place --

2 MS. SWIFT: Larger sites would provide  
3 actual parks.

4 MR. MOORE: Okay. One thing I've been  
5 struck by, if you look at the White Flint plans,  
6 like option 7, that's what these things would look  
7 like if we didn't have the access lanes. It's  
8 three lanes of travel, and then a parking lane  
9 that's totally unprotected right next to that. I  
10 look at that and I think, that is insane. The  
11 idea of opening your door onto -- what's the speed  
12 limit for our section of Rockville Pike?

13 MR. SIMONEAU: Forty-five.

14 MR. MOORE: Forty-five and that's a  
15 conservative estimate. Opening your door into a  
16 45 mile an hour plus traffic doesn't make sense at  
17 all.

18 MR. SIMONEAU: You will not see us make  
19 that recommendation. We think that not only  
20 doesn't make sense and unsafe, we do not believe  
21 State Highway will approve that on their state  
22 road. Find me a state highway in this state that

1 has parallel parking along it.

2 We met and said we are strongly opposed  
3 to -- universally and staff -- recommend any  
4 parking on a road that is going that fast. Matter  
5 of fact, even on some of our roads -- you have  
6 Wootton Parkway, etc. -- we don't put parallel  
7 parking on those roads.

8 MR. MOORE: Right.

9 MR. SIMONEAU: It's just patently unsafe  
10 going those speeds to have somebody open up the  
11 door --

12 MR. MOORE: But it's kind of striking  
13 that both of the --

14 MR. SIMONEAU: -- or try to back in  
15 somewhere when there's traffic going (inaudible)  
16 pull in parallel park.

17 MR. LEVY: Right. Just one little  
18 piece. Sometimes the State Highway, for example  
19 on the eastern shore, will go right through  
20 downtown, and it'll be a business state highway.  
21 It might have parking in that setting. I just  
22 wanted to say I could find you one --

1 MR. MOORE: At 45 miles an hour?

2 MR. LEVY: -- but not at 45 miles an  
3 hour.

4 MR. MOORE: But that's striking that  
5 both of the county White Flint sector plans  
6 include that, I think. I think it's, what --

7 MR. LEVY: I think the --

8 MS. KEBBA: No.

9 MR. LEVY: I don't think the other one  
10 does.

11 MAYOR NEWTON: The other one has transit  
12 on the side.

13 MR. LEVY: Yeah, because the other one  
14 has semi- dedicated transit.

15 MR. MOORE: What's the fourth and fifth  
16 lanes on the other side there?

17 MR. ELSHAFEI: Turn lanes.

18 MR. MOORE: They also have an 80-foot  
19 sidewalk as far as I can tell.

20 MR. LEVY: Yeah. The outer lanes are  
21 the semi- dedicated transit lanes.

22 MR. MOORE: Okay.



1 MR. LEVY: What that means is that  
2 that's where the buses would go, and cars could  
3 only go in them if they were turning right. If  
4 you know Coastal Highway in Ocean City --

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Mm-hmm.

6 MR. LEVY: -- where the bus lanes are on  
7 the outer lane. If you're going there but when  
8 you want to go right, you're going to pull into  
9 that lane and turn right. In Clark's  
10 representation, he's got a bus in one and a car in  
11 the other.

12 MR. MOORE: Oh, I see.

13 MR. LEVY: Is that right? Did I get that  
14 right, Clark?

15 MR. MOORE: But they're both bus lanes?

16 MR. LEVY: Yes. Neither of these are  
17 parking.

18 MR. MOORE: Gotcha, gotcha.

19 MR. SIMONEAU: They're less dedicated  
20 because you make turn movements from it.

21 MR. MOORE: Okay. Anyway, someone was  
22 trying to sell me on this, and they said, well,

1 just think about Connecticut Avenue near the  
2 uptown where it's two lanes of travel and then  
3 you've got that parallel parking. But I was  
4 thinking the speed limit in DC is 25.

5 MAYOR NEWTON: It's lower, yeah.

6 MR. MOORE: It's much lower.

7 Connecticut Avenue is a big road, but that's  
8 apples and oranges. (inaudible) constructing,  
9 when I thought about it, okay, if we were to get  
10 rid of these local lanes, if we were to  
11 reconfigure this, what would they look like? The  
12 idea of moving to the White Flint Sector Plan just  
13 seems crazy and again, wouldn't even be -- it's  
14 almost useless to consider it because State  
15 Highway will never approve it. We might as well  
16 put something forward that's going to be approved.

17 MR. LEVY: We did develop an option that  
18 does not have access lanes, that does not have  
19 parking lanes --

20 MR. MOORE: Right.

21 MR. LEVY: -- on the outside for  
22 consideration. It's not a Planning Commission

1 recommendation. That's one of the ones that we  
2 put forward -- is that six?

3 MS. KEBBA: Five or six, yeah.

4 MR. LEVY: I think it's six.

5 MR. MOORE: Mm-hmm.

6 MR. SIMONEAU: Right. Yes, six.

7 MR. LEVY: That's a turn lane, Okay.

8 MR. SIMONEAU: What would have to happen  
9 in that case without having parking on the main  
10 lane is the parking would go on the side streets  
11 and the parking would be limited to the garages  
12 that would (inaudible) the Chapmans. You go turn  
13 on a side lane, you get on Chapman, you'd access  
14 the garages from the other side.

15 The State Highway will not allow as many  
16 curb cuts on Rockville Pike if the access lane's  
17 not there. Therefore, every developer will not  
18 get a curb-cut permit from State Highway right up  
19 front there, and they'll be trying to force the  
20 curb cuts to be on the back side. That's where  
21 the Chapmans come in handy, that's where all those  
22 road networks that are already there in all the

1 plans anyway. But more traffic and more access  
2 will probably be made from there and less be made  
3 from the Pike.

4 MR. MOORE: Even option 6, if we do  
5 option 6 and I've got a building that's going to  
6 sit back from that, can you put parking between  
7 the building and the sidewalks that we have here?  
8 Is that the --

9 MR. SIMONEAU: The building and the  
10 sidewalk are contiguous. There is no space just  
11 like Town Center. In the urban environment --

12 MR. LEVY: Right.

13 MR. SIMONEAU: -- now in our design, the  
14 sidewalk touches the building --

15 MR. LEVY: Okay.

16 MR. SIMONEAU: -- and there's nothing  
17 between there.

18 MR. MOORE: Even if we pulled it in,  
19 you'd have -- one of the concerns we've heard is  
20 that if you go too wide it destroys a significant  
21 portion of the parking that they have now with the  
22 semi-access lanes that we have. But it looks like



1 even if we pull it in you're not going to have  
2 parking between -- you'll probably have less  
3 parking.

4 MR. SIMONEAU: There will be no parking  
5 between the building and the road unless there's  
6 an access lane.

7 MR. MOORE: Okay.

8 MR. SIMONEAU: Everything will be in  
9 structured parking. That will either be in back  
10 or disguised in the front based upon the zoning  
11 ordinance, requirements, and everything. You can  
12 pull in there from the access lane or from the  
13 road and get in there. It can be underneath the  
14 building, it can be in back of the building, it  
15 can be wherever the zoning writ says. You will  
16 not have parking lots up front anymore. That's  
17 one of the big differences between this plan and  
18 what you have up in Rockville Pike now.

19 MR. MOORE: Gotcha.

20 MR. SIMONEAU: You're moving the  
21 building faces to the sidewalk so that you create  
22 an experience there. Even more so, you actually

1 create it under the sidewalk. What we've done is  
2 we've allowed utilities to go in the sidewalk.

3 In our normal plan it used to be that  
4 you had to have an easement, a 10-foot easement,  
5 beyond the sidewalk like in residential areas. A  
6 public utility is meant for those -- Pepco,  
7 Comcast -- for all those utilities to go in that  
8 space. What we've done creatively is said, okay,  
9 even if we own the sidewalks, we'll allow  
10 utilities to go underneath and dual use the land  
11 for that and make it more compact so the building  
12 can come right there and the sidewalk can go there  
13 and the utilities can service there all together.  
14 You've approved that in the new Business District  
15 Road Plan.

16 MR. MOORE: Right.

17 MAYOR NEWTON: Sir?

18 MR. MOORE: Thank you. Another  
19 objection we've heard -- and this one is new to me  
20 and I haven't seen any of the materials -- is that  
21 State Highway has got 120 feet right now of  
22 right-of-way, but that's with the -- stormwater

1 management requirements that they would need 162  
2 feet. How should we evaluate that statement?

3 MR. SIMONEAU: Anytime you construct new  
4 pavement, you have to comply with the new state  
5 stormwater requirements. The state stormwater  
6 requirement says you do environmental site design  
7 to the maximum extent possible onsite. We're  
8 working with the state right now on the CCT.

9 In fact, they are using the green areas  
10 on the side of the road to do stormwater  
11 management in them, and they're trying to do it  
12 creatively by still allowing some trees to be in  
13 there. They're creating a little bit of a buffer  
14 in doing that, and they're managing a lot of the  
15 stormwater in there. Once you do what's -- to the  
16 maximum extent practicable, then you have to send  
17 it somewhere else -- to stormwater ponds, etc.

18 There will be an onsite requirement for  
19 stormwater, and we propose to do it in these  
20 greenspaces that we have in the medians, to use  
21 that to the maximum extent possible to put the  
22 stormwater management requires.

1 MR. MOORE: But we don't have any  
2 concern that State Highway is going to need an  
3 extra 21 feet on each side just dedicated to  
4 stormwater management and nothing else.

5 MR. SIMONEAU: If you take out all of  
6 the green medians, yes, we do have that concern.  
7 But if you leave in the green medians as we have  
8 them, we have much less of a concern. We haven't  
9 done the calculation, we haven't gone through an  
10 approval process, and frankly it might not be us  
11 going through the approval process; it'll be the  
12 state going through it, and it might be the state  
13 MDE, who's issuing the permits for it, not the  
14 City of Rockville.

15 Their view of what the maximum extent  
16 practical may be slightly different than ours, but  
17 if you put more impervious surfaces, then there  
18 needs to be space to do stormwater management.

19 MR. MOORE: Okay. But --

20 MAYOR NEWTON: Can you do stormwater  
21 management down the middle of the BRT and make  
22 that grass underneath the BRT lanes?



1 MR. SIMONEAU: Theoretically, yes.  
2 Every time they've studied that, I don't think  
3 anybody has come back and said, yes, we can do it,  
4 and yes, we will do it. They've always found  
5 difficulties with doing that.

6 MR. MOORE: Okay.

7 MR. SIMONEAU: But theoretically,  
8 there's actually a greenspace around -- for  
9 example, where the stations are there's actually  
10 two lanes there. Where you don't have stations,  
11 there's greenspace in there. That's a potential  
12 stormwater management area, and if you do it  
13 creatively you can still put some trees in there.

14 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

15 MR. SIMONEAU: It may not be the size  
16 that you might see them. They have to survive in  
17 a stormwater environment, but there's creative  
18 ways to actually green it up at the same time  
19 you're doing it.

20 MS. CARR: Right. The issue with  
21 stormwater there, and it's probably two-fold, is  
22 that you're both trying to decrease the amount of

1       impervious surface that you have through the  
2       greenspaces but also building underground, unseen  
3       ways to capture stormwater as well. Is that where  
4       the additional space is needed or is it really  
5       just through the onsite mitigation techniques  
6       through vegetation?

7               MR. SIMONEAU: Doing it onsite through  
8       the vegetation is cheaper. Doing structural  
9       measures belowground is much more expensive and at  
10      some point becomes impractical for a long stretch  
11      of area. Both techniques do slightly different  
12      things, but they're both acceptable.

13             Your first statement was that you're  
14      trying to minimize the imperviousness. The only  
15      reason you're doing stormwater management is  
16      because you're adding imperviousness, if you  
17      would.

18             If you didn't touch Rockville Pike, the  
19      state doesn't require you to do anything more  
20      because it's an existing condition. It's when you  
21      add a bike lane; it's when you add the BRT lanes;  
22      it's when you add the sidewalk. When you add all

1     that stuff, the requirement then increases to  
2     manage the stormwater management.

3                 MS. CARR: Right. To Councilmember  
4     Moore's point that the State Highway  
5     Administration is saying that they need 162 feet,  
6     part of that is to accommodate the actual  
7     stormwater infrastructure?

8                 MR. SIMONEAU: Possibly so. I'm not  
9     sure where that statement came from, but  
10    stormwater has to be managed, and it has to be  
11    managed somewhere. Usually we try to manage it  
12    onsite as much as possible. A lot of times here  
13    the first choice would be to try to do it in those  
14    green areas as -- which is being done in the CCT  
15    right now. They're almost at a 30 percent design  
16    level, and they're having fairly good success with  
17    achieving a decent amount of onsite management in  
18    those green areas.

19                MR. MOORE: When I think of this stretch  
20    of Rockville Pike, and I think of it from the 270  
21    feet wide that we have, I don't think of there  
22    being a lot of pervious surfaces there now. Why

1 would there be more impervious services if one of  
2 these plans were built? There's just not a lot of  
3 green there. You look at the size of the  
4 medians --

5 MAYOR NEWTON: I think it's just --

6 MR. MOORE: -- I mean, it looks like  
7 there would be substantially more greenspace.

8 MAYOR NEWTON: I think you're right,  
9 Tom, but I think it's because we're doing  
10 something. Once you do anything -- renovation,  
11 reconstruction, whatever -- you get caught up in  
12 the new code. As long as you don't do anything --

13 MR. MOORE: Is it that there's more --

14 MAYOR NEWTON: It's really not a matter  
15 of whether we're doing the bikeway or the  
16 sidewalk. It's that we're changing --

17 MR. MOORE: Right.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: -- what's there.

19 MR. MOORE: It's not that it's more --

20 MR. SIMONEAU: You're precisely correct.

21 MR. MOORE: Okay. It's not the amount  
22 of impervious surfaces that are required?



1                   MR. SIMONEAU: What would happen is --  
2     let's face it. Where the extra land is coming  
3     from is currently probably parking for businesses  
4     or informal access lanes now and maybe a dollop of  
5     green here and there. As you dig that up and say,  
6     okay, I want to build an access lane or I want to  
7     build more roadway because I'm pushing something  
8     out there and say, okay, you're adding space, so  
9     you have to manage that stormwater management. We  
10    don't care if it used to be a parking lot because  
11    it wasn't managed when it was a parking lot. They  
12    just built it.

13                  MR. MOORE: Gotcha.

14                  MR. SIMONEAU: Depending how old it was  
15    -- some of them had built there. When they had  
16    done recent additions, they had to comply with the  
17    new law. They've complied as much as they can to  
18    the max percent possible. Then they pay a fee in  
19    lieu, and we basically manage it after that  
20    because it goes into a stormwater facility or it  
21    goes somewhere else.

22                  MR. LEVY: But just the fact of putting

1 in the BRT from the state point-of-view widens the  
2 Pike because you can't get a State Complete street  
3 in the state's 120 feet in Rockville. It would  
4 widen. If it were a state project to do the BRT,  
5 they would have to mitigate the additional state  
6 impervious surface in any event.

7 MR. MOORE: At the end of that process,  
8 would the state have more than 120 feet; is that  
9 the thought?

10 MR. LEVY: Almost certainly.

11 MR. MOORE: Okay.

12 MR. LEVY: Under any option, Option 3,  
13 which is the Planning Commission 2014, which is  
14 the same. Anytime you put the BRT lanes in the  
15 middle, you can see the 120- foot state is  
16 measured. You're only getting to the curbs of the  
17 driving and bus areas.

18 The state -- correct me if I'm wrong --  
19 has also a Complete Streets policy, and they  
20 couldn't approve a cross section that didn't have  
21 sidewalks and didn't have some sort of treatment  
22 for bicycles and was addressing stormwater

1 management in the way that the state requires it.

2 The White Flint Sector Plan says up to  
3 152 or 164 feet themselves.

4 MS. SWIFT: (inaudible)

5 MR. LEVY: Yeah, 162 feet --

6 MR. MOORE: Right.

7 MR. LEVY: -- is the state right-of-way.

8 It's another 42 feet even to do the White Flint  
9 Sector approach.

10 MR. MOORE: Okay. It's funny. If you  
11 think about the main state part of Rockville Pike,  
12 there aren't going to be any sidewalks there at  
13 all. All the sidewalks are pushed way out. It  
14 can be a State Complete street. They don't care  
15 if there are sidewalks on city land or  
16 city-controlled easements or right-of-way just as  
17 long as they're there somewhere; is that the  
18 thought?

19 MR. SIMONEAU: That's generally correct.  
20 They will partner with the local authority if  
21 their road ends at a curb and there's a sidewalk  
22 there. They will have deemed that to be a

1 Complete Street. Just as, for example, on Veirs  
2 Mill Road, there are access lanes on Veirs Mill  
3 Road.

4 MR. LEVY: Right.

5 MR. SIMONEAU: Guess who maintains those  
6 access roads? The City of Rockville does. They  
7 are more than willing to let local municipalities  
8 maintain part of the infrastructure along state  
9 roads: Sidewalks, we shovel sidewalks on  
10 occasion, we maintain access lanes. It's really  
11 the Complete Street's going to be there as long as  
12 the sidewalk meets their criteria.

13 One thing to clear here is if we do  
14 nothing, the City of Rockville does nothing, and  
15 the state and the county come through and build  
16 the BRT and they leave the three lanes in each  
17 direction as it is, that is they don't repurpose a  
18 lane for -- take away a drive and make a dedicated  
19 bus lane, they will almost certainly have to widen  
20 the Pike wider than it currently is right now.  
21 They will have to do certain things like  
22 accommodate bike facilities, stormwater



1 management, and sidewalks. Right now the sidewalk  
2 you have on Rockville Pike, I believe, is 5 feet,  
3 and it's --

4 MAYOR NEWTON: If it's that.

5 MR. SIMONEAU: -- sitting right against  
6 the curb.

7 MAYOR NEWTON: Yep.

8 MR. SIMONEAU: It's four in some places.

9 MAYOR NEWTON: I was going to say --

10 MR. SIMONEAU: Yeah.

11 MAYOR NEWTON: -- I didn't think it was  
12 five.

13 MR. SIMONEAU: It's sitting right  
14 against the curb in some places.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

16 MR. SIMONEAU: Now, I know everybody's  
17 looking like we don't like that; we don't. We'd  
18 like to push it back. We'd like to have that  
19 buffer area and everything. But the bottom line  
20 is they're going to try to fit what they can in  
21 there while taking everything.

22 It's our job now to say, okay, they can

1      come without us. If they're going to come, how  
2      are we going to make sure it meets what we think  
3      is the best criteria? We don't want that sidewalk  
4      to only be -- I don't think they'd build a 4-foot  
5      sidewalk if they rebuilt it. They'd probably  
6      build at least five. I think that's their  
7      standard too now, but 5 feet on Rockville Pike --

8                   MAYOR NEWTON: Is not enough.

9                   MR. SIMONEAU: -- is not enough. We all  
10     know that.

11                  MR. LEVY: We attempted to put together  
12     -- Option is actually existing conditions in the  
13     sense of the 1989 plan. That's 1989 plan if the  
14     state did what Craig said, we're going to now do  
15     BRT, and we made some assumptions here. It's got,  
16     frankly, a bike lane right on the Pike, which we  
17     don't actually think would happen. But as it  
18     happens, one of the options in the Veirs Mill  
19     discussion included a bike lane on Veirs Mill  
20     Road, which we communicated was not particularly  
21     what we preferred.

22                  This shows a little bit of what Craig

1 was saying. The sidewalk is right near the road.

2 MR. SIMONEAU: These drawings are very  
3 nice and pretty and they're good, but what they  
4 don't show you is how you get from present  
5 condition to any one of these drawings. We all  
6 know besides sidewalks and all of that, we have  
7 utility poles there. I'm going to bet that if you  
8 find one or two of those poles that will stay in  
9 it's current location with building any of these  
10 options, that would be a very longshot bet.  
11 They'll probably all have to move. Of course,  
12 we'll say, we want them on the ground.

13 MAYOR NEWTON: I was going to say that  
14 was one of the things that --

15 MR. SIMONEAU: Correct.

16 MAYOR NEWTON: -- we said we wanted to  
17 talk about.

18 MR. SIMONEAU: Nothing you do is easy on  
19 Rockville Pike.

20 MAYOR NEWTON: Right. Councilmember  
21 Feinberg?

22 MS. FEINBERG: Yeah, just if we may. I

1     assume it would be you on the transportation side.  
2     On Option 5, have there been any configurations of  
3     boulevards where the bike lanes are only on one  
4     side in terms of a dedicated bike lane? I see  
5     that's one of the deltas on Option 5.

6                 MR. LEVY:   Yep.

7                 MS. FEINBERG:  If you can address that;  
8     has there been any experience? Then the other  
9     part of it is on the east side in Option 5 it  
10    shows the bike lane being shared with vehicular  
11    traffic, which to me doesn't seem like a good idea  
12    at all.

13                MR. MOORE:  But it's in the access  
14    lanes, which is not bad.

15                MS. FEINBERG:  I understand it's the  
16    access lane on the east side, but still you're  
17    competing the bicycle traffic and the vehicular.  
18    Albeit slower, but you're competing.

19                MR. MOORE:  Right.

20                MS. FEINBERG:  But if you can speak to  
21    the idea of has it ever been successful limiting a  
22    bike lane on only one side of a dedicated bike



1 lane?

2 MR. ELSHAFEI: Let me just start by  
3 saying this is not one of my preferred options  
4 because we had some conversation about that, but  
5 I'll tell you a couple things.

6 Has this been done in the past? Yes, it  
7 has been done. I think Ocean City would have an  
8 example like that. You have the bus lane, and you  
9 have bikers using the same lane. But the reason  
10 this option is on the table is because the east  
11 side -- and if you are looking at this, the east  
12 side is the one on the right side --

13 MS. FEINBERG: Right, right.

14 MR. ELSHAFEI: -- is not a continuous  
15 access road. At some portion of the Pike, and  
16 maybe we can show where, this access lane is not  
17 continuous throughout the plan, the Rockville Pike  
18 Plan that we have. Therefore, the idea was, okay,  
19 if we are going to cut some of the bike lanes,  
20 where do we cut them? That's why this option came  
21 up, that we're going to allow them to ride with  
22 the buses or the cars here --

1 MS. FEINBERG: To share.

2 MR. ELSHAFEI: -- but at the same time,  
3 on the west side we are going to keep the cycle  
4 track, which is bikes on both sides. I do not  
5 prefer this because I feel this access lane is not  
6 really a good thing to share the bikes with the  
7 cars because this is not just cars. The access  
8 lane will be Fedex, UPS, maybe even -- anyway,  
9 there will be cars. People will stop; people will  
10 park. Preferably, I would rather have a 5-foot  
11 bike lane than having them riding with the cars.

12 MS. FEINBERG: Could you answer in terms  
13 of the second part of the question: Have there  
14 been any built where the dedicated bike lanes are  
15 only on one side, east or west?

16 MR. ELSHAFEI: Usually not, no.

17 MS. FEINBERG: Not --

18 MR. ELSHAFEI: Anybody who's building a  
19 road, they try to be consistent and put the same  
20 facility on the east and west side.

21 MR. MOORE: Would you put both sides on  
22 both sides? That's one thing. You could do north

1 to the north side and --

2 MS. FEINBERG: Yeah. I'm looking for  
3 some other option. That's what I'm --

4 MR. SIMONEAU: Except one side doesn't  
5 go through, like Emad said.

6 MR. MOORE: Right.

7 MR. SIMONEAU: To think that you're  
8 going to put a single bike lane on each side and  
9 they're going to go through is not going to work  
10 --

11 MS. FEINBERG: It's not workable.

12 MR. SIMONEAU: -- because they're going  
13 to have to cross the Pike to get on the other  
14 side.

15 MR. MOORE: You'd end up (inaudible) on  
16 the south side. You'd get stuck there, and you'd  
17 never go --

18 MR. SIMONEAU: Plus, bicyclists tend to  
19 travel in the direction the want to travel anyway.

20 MR. ELSHAFEI: Or at some point, if the  
21 access lane does not exist, we can try to be  
22 creative and have some bike facilities pass

1 through it. It's either part of the sidewalk and  
2 be (inaudible) for the bicyclists.

3 MR. LEVY: What we were trying to do is  
4 explore options for narrowing.

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, that's what --

6 MR. LEVY: We heard what you heard:  
7 Folks concerned about the width. We looked at the  
8 various features, and we said, okay, what is it  
9 without the access roads? Especially on the east  
10 side because the railroad tracks are right there.  
11 That's the reason that the access road, even if  
12 constructed, would have to go away because the  
13 Planning Commission heard the testimony of  
14 concerns of businesses during that process. 'Wait  
15 a minute, you're talking about going up here? My  
16 property is already so narrow.'

17 The language in the plan right now is  
18 very, very flexible in terms of what would happen  
19 in the middle and north parts of the east side.  
20 The Planning Commission ultimately did not want to  
21 do access roads in this area because they're  
22 already so constrained.



1           The question is, all right, if we're not  
2   going to have access roads and there would still  
3   potentially be the informal service roads that we  
4   would use for parking, as they are right now, and  
5   so let's do what they want. Folks would probably  
6   go up there, as some of us have ourselves, and  
7   there's a bike shop there, Revolution Bikes.  
8   Sometimes you do that just to get to the bike  
9   shop, as it happens.

10           But one option we thought we would bring  
11   to you, albeit it's not Emad's preferred option,  
12   is what if we saw that we didn't have the  
13   dedicated lanes here and we didn't have it here,  
14   then how would we be able to address bike  
15   facilities. Keep in mind, by the way, the  
16   Bethesda Trolley Trail bike route that comes up  
17   from Bethesda stops right now because of Chapman  
18   Avenue. There's a sign, 'end of trail,' right on  
19   Chapman Avenue just on the southern end of the  
20   Twinbrook Metro Station.

21           Under that scenario, one way to address  
22   it would be to have the trail continue up Chapman

1 Avenue or the signage, probably, would be a  
2 determination whether it be a bike lane or signs.  
3 That would be a main part of the continuous  
4 facility. Then we had a very back-and-forth  
5 discussion. What do you do in the access lane if  
6 you have it? We represented it here, but that's  
7 not a decision that we would have to make.

8 MR. SIMONEAU: Ultimately that bike  
9 traffic on that east side would be local bike  
10 traffic because it can't go north through.

11 MR. LEVY: Right.

12 MR. SIMONEAU: The idea is how do you  
13 provide a local service because they've got to get  
14 to their destination, and if they're presumably  
15 going all the way through, we'd provide a crossing  
16 where Chapman comes up and everything beginning on  
17 that cycle track to get over there. You've got to  
18 find local bike access on that side.

19 MR. ELSHAFFI: The original plan that we  
20 had before we started the Planning Commission, the  
21 consultant plan, the draft one, was showing a  
22 shared lane for the buses and bikes; I do believe

1 15 feet each. There were no bike lanes in the  
2 original plan that we started with. Out of that  
3 action, we have now cycle tracks on both sides.

4 MAYOR NEWTON: I have two things, and  
5 one is I see bikes all the time now on the Pike.  
6 There are so many people that commute by bike now  
7 up and down on the sidewalks. I think it's  
8 something that's grown exponentially in the past  
9 couple of years.

10 The other one is just a question about  
11 the access roads. On page 4 of your memo, the  
12 second bullet, it says, 'The design of the already  
13 existing but unformalized access roads was  
14 developed so that they would function consistently  
15 for the length of the plan area though not  
16 continue through intersections.' How would that  
17 work? If you've got an access road but it's not  
18 going to get through the intersection, do you come  
19 back onto the main road to go through the  
20 intersection?

21 MR. LEVY: Yes. I don't know if you  
22 remember way back when even with the -- did you

1 want to do that, Emad?

2 MR. MOORE: This isn't the current plan  
3 though.

4 MR. ELSHAFEI: I don't know if this  
5 portion in the memo meant what was in the past,  
6 but this plan does not suggest that people in the  
7 access lanes would not be able to go through.  
8 Actually, I think there are a couple options.

9 MAYOR NEWTON: This is from the  
10 consultant's draft, but this didn't carry through  
11 in to the current part?

12 MR. SIMONEAU: Yeah, we dismissed the  
13 option of the access lanes not going through the  
14 intersections in our deliberations, and the  
15 Planning Commission approved bringing the new  
16 access lanes as proposed through the  
17 intersections.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay, okay. Great.  
19 Great, great.

20 MR. SIMONEAU: There was something  
21 called a weave, and I don't even want to go and  
22 talk to you about that --



1                   MAYOR NEWTON: I'm just trying to figure  
2 out how that was going to work, so okay. Good.  
3 Councilmember Palakovich Carr?

4                   MS. CARR: Thank you, Madame Mayor.  
5 Yeah, I have too seen a lot more bicyclists since  
6 the State Highway administration put up the signs  
7 on Rockville Pike that you're saying that  
8 bicyclists have the right to use the full lane and  
9 surprised at the number of (inaudible) people who  
10 are actually biking in traffic. It shows the  
11 demand is there.

12                  MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

13                  MS. CARR: Hopefully we can do better by  
14 doing cycle tracks there. Actually, I wanted to  
15 go back to talk a little bit about the Option 4  
16 versus Option 6.

17                   One of the things I've been thinking  
18 about while evaluating the access roads and  
19 whether or not there's going to be these teaser  
20 parallel parking spots is basically is the Pike  
21 going to be something where it's inward facing  
22 like Town Center is where you drive by and you may

1 not really see what's there or the retail  
2 establishments are going to face out onto the  
3 Pike.

4 I think that's one thing that needs to  
5 be factored in as we are thinking about the future  
6 of Rockville Pike because if you want to have an  
7 outward facing, more Pike- centric new development  
8 in the future, it seems important to have some of  
9 that parking available out front. As staff have  
10 said, the White Flint Plan parallel parking  
11 directly on the roads is probably not the safest  
12 option to go, and we'd probably lean more towards  
13 the access lanes.

14 There may be arguments to be made in  
15 terms of facing development the other way, but I  
16 think it's just another factor to add to the  
17 discussion here.

18 MR. LEVY: If I might, that was a  
19 significant conversation with the Planning  
20 Commission about whether to have parking in the  
21 access roads. Interestingly enough, whether to  
22 have access roads or not virtually didn't come up

1 at all during the deliberations. That doesn't  
2 mean it's not completely legitimate, but it  
3 didn't. But there was a big discussion about what  
4 the features would be.

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

6 MR. LEVY: There was a big discussion  
7 about whether there should be parking or not, and  
8 actually some of the retail owners and property  
9 owners submitted testimony saying that yes,  
10 frontage parking would be beneficial, including  
11 (inaudible) submitted testimony along those lines  
12 during that discussion supporting the frontage  
13 parking, that it would be beneficial to the retail  
14 that was facing the Pike --

15 MS. CARR: It's something we heard in --

16 MR. LEVY: -- in the access roads when  
17 --

18 MAYOR NEWTON: Right. I think  
19 Councilmember Palakovich Carr brings up a great  
20 point about outward facing, and I think that would  
21 be something we would definitely want to encourage  
22 so that we don't end up with what's happening in

1 Town Center where people drive by and are  
2 thinking, where is Town Center.

3 MR. LEVY: Right, and whether that has  
4 been part of the issue with retail -- I mean,  
5 retail has multiple issues. It obviously opened  
6 into a recession and a retail environment  
7 generally is difficult, but the fact that it's  
8 hard to see --

9 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

10 MR. LEVY: -- that it's there is a  
11 design question, certainly.

12 MAYOR NEWTON: Exactly. Councilmember  
13 Moore?

14 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor.  
15 One of the things that was mentioned to me by  
16 those trying to convince us not to put the access  
17 lanes on where they're -- like, with their  
18 buildings was that the city would be incurring a  
19 significant obligation by taking on the  
20 responsibility of building and maintaining the  
21 access lanes. That they would be ours. It's  
22 paving them, plowing them -- just everything that



1 we do with streets everywhere else in the city.

2 How major an obligation does Public Works consider  
3 that to be, and is it something that concerns you?

4 MR. SIMONEAU: One hundred sixty miles  
5 of roads in the city; 1.5 miles more of access  
6 lanes, that's about one percent. That's the  
7 concern level.

8 MR. MOORE: Okay.

9 MR. SIMONEAU: We can plow the access  
10 lanes. That's not a concern. The construction  
11 cost, let's be honest now, that is the major  
12 concern. Repaving it, we have 160 miles; repaving  
13 1.5 more miles -- how significant is that? Not  
14 much. But it's the initial cost of the access  
15 lanes that is probably one of the biggest  
16 concerns.

17 Now, is the city going to have to bear  
18 the cost of all that? I don't know. Is the  
19 federal government going to be helping with the  
20 whole project? If so, we think that we get the  
21 federal government to help with the access lanes  
22 also because the access lanes provide another

1 great advantage, which is that's where all those  
2 utilities are going to go.

3 MR. MOORE: Right.

4 MR. SIMONEAU: We have utilities  
5 smattered up and down Rockville Pike. Our  
6 waterlines are in there. When we get out there to  
7 have a water break we're blocking two lanes of  
8 Rockville Pike. We're fixing that water break  
9 whether it happens at 7:00 in the morning or 3:00  
10 in the afternoon. Our workers are out there in  
11 main Rockville Pike. We would choose to relocate  
12 as many utilities as we can into those access  
13 lanes, and we close down an access lane for the  
14 repair. Pepco -- as many as possible. There's  
15 other (inaudible) benefits to doing that. The  
16 major concern I would have is not maintaining it,  
17 not repaving it. It's initial cost of  
18 construction, as is the concern with a lot of the  
19 plan because it's an ambitious plan overall.

20 MAYOR NEWTON: Because my math may not  
21 be right, how do you get 1.5 miles when it's a  
22 2-mile stretch and we would have an access lane on

1 each side?

2 MR. SIMONEAU: The access lane does not  
3 go all the way up on the east side.

4 MAYOR NEWTON: Oh, that's right.

5 MR. SIMONEAU: Yeah.

6 MAYOR NEWTON: That's right.

7 MR. SIMONEAU: You have one mile --

8 MAYOR NEWTON: It'd be half a mile --

9 MR. SIMONEAU: -- all the way up on one  
10 side, and I'm guessing half of the length on the  
11 --

12 MR. LEVY: It's probably a little less  
13 even; 1.3 or something like that (inaudible).

14 MR. SIMONEAU: A little less, yeah.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: Thank you.

16 MR. SIMONEAU: Thank you.

17 MAYOR NEWTON: Other comments?

18 MR. LEVY: We ended up on the second  
19 question of this, which is perfectly good.

20 Actually, in sitting around we assumed this would  
21 be a big conversation because it's worthy. It's a  
22 worthy one. It's important.

1           The options that we put forth here, they  
2   don't have to be the only options. The question  
3   should the access roads that run parallel to  
4   Rockville Pike A) -- and this is the Planning  
5   Commission draft as it is now -- be formalized  
6   according to the design proposed in the Planning  
7   Commission draft; B) remain as they exist now as  
8   guided most recently by the 1989 plan and the  
9   easements that the city already holds for them be  
10   maintained, and I would add continue to be  
11   collected as we go; C) be removed so that the  
12   buildings are at sidewalk and sidewalk is adjacent  
13   to main travel lanes. Additional comments, but  
14   that's similar to the White Flint Sector Plan  
15   alternate to -- or be formalized according to some  
16   other design. Formalize, do what we continue to  
17   do, or get rid of it.

18           MR. SIMONEAU: Informalize by some other  
19   design might be the city takes over. At some  
20   point, you have enough of the businesses who have  
21   dedicated lanes, and the city then decides that  
22   they are going to formalize the access roads and



1 control them because if you try to look at -- on  
2 certain sides they are more formal, if you would.  
3 But stop signs are not formalized. It's a lot of  
4 traffic control. Eventually when you get past a  
5 certain point, the city, if you leave it like it  
6 is, might want to step in and say, okay, we're  
7 going to make these formal city streets and put  
8 them as they are now but formalize them.

9 You don't have a different (inaudible)  
10 at every intersection, but it's where it is now,  
11 and it's just formalized where it is now.

12 MR. LEVY: The consultants originally  
13 actually recommended two lanes. Now they didn't  
14 have a BRT, but they recommended two lanes plus a  
15 parking lane and the access roads.

16 MR. MOORE: Each way, like two way --

17 MR. LEVY: On each side it was two, and  
18 one was going to be the bus/bike and one was going  
19 to be cars and then there would be parking.  
20 That's a different design. There's too many  
21 options. The big question that I think you're  
22 considering is are these things of value as they

1 are, enhanced, or should Rockville move away from  
2 what it's been doing.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: One of the comments that  
4 Councilmember Moore brought up was that the speed  
5 is different on Connecticut Avenue and Wisconsin  
6 Avenue than it is on Rockville Pike, but that  
7 doesn't have to stay that way. I keep going back  
8 to what is the goal we're looking for. If we  
9 really are trying to create a place, then maybe we  
10 don't have a 45 mile speed limit on Rockville  
11 Pike. Maybe it does ratchet down a little bit. I  
12 just think we've got to figure out, before we  
13 start getting boxed into making decision, what are  
14 we trying to do. What are we trying to create  
15 there? Councilmember Moore?

16 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor. I  
17 think we need to remember that this is a state  
18 road. I'll put it this way --

19 MAYOR NEWTON: Isn't it a state road on  
20 Wisconsin Avenue and in Bethesda as well?

21 MR. LEVY: Yes.

22 MR. MOORE: Yes, but I think DC is a

1 jurisdiction that has a 25 mile an hour speed  
2 limit.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: Last time I checked  
4 Bethesda was in Maryland.

5 MR. MOORE: (inaudible) --

6 MR. ELSHAFEI: The state makes the  
7 decision on state roads everywhere in the state.  
8 It doesn't matter if it's close to DC or -- of  
9 course, in DC it's not a state road anymore, but  
10 what I'm saying is the state makes the decision on  
11 the speed limit -- 45, 55. Of course, when they  
12 go through some areas in Connecticut or Wisconsin,  
13 they see the road maybe is a little bit narrower  
14 and maybe the speed limit can be different.

15 MR. MOORE: Let me put it this way.  
16 What are the chances that State Highway is going  
17 to reduce the speed limit on the part of Rockville  
18 Pike that we're talking about?

19 MAYOR NEWTON: Significant if we ask for  
20 it.

21 MR. MOORE: Okay. If we get on our  
22 knees and beg for it, what are the chances that

1       they're going to do it?

2                   MR. ELSHAFEI: I was just going to say  
3       -- I mean, the speed is not an issue on Rockville  
4       Pike. We know that the traffic does not move on  
5       Rockville Pike. On what basis are we going to ask  
6       the state to reduce from 40 to 35?

7                   MR. MOORE: I think the Mayor's made a  
8       good point. If the speeds were lower, then you  
9       would have a situation that was more like  
10      Connecticut Avenue downtown where it might be  
11      moderately safer to parallel park there at certain  
12      times. That would give us more options to look at  
13      here.

14                   My impression is that this is a major  
15      arterial and State Highway values the throughput,  
16      and there is very little chance that they would  
17      significantly or at all reduce the speed limits no  
18      matter what the City of Rockville asks for.

19                   MR. ELSHAFEI: I just want to clarify  
20      that what this plan is showing on this section of  
21      the Rockville Pike, this is by no means we are  
22      trying to make or the proposed plan is trying to



1 make this road like a highway. Like you said, we  
2 have (inaudible) three lanes; the plan shows three  
3 lanes. There is no more capacity. I feel like  
4 it's not significant at all any capacity we are  
5 adding to this plan. If anything, we are just  
6 trying to make it a little bit more efficient and  
7 little bit safer.

8 MR. MOORE: Yeah.

9 MR. ELSHAFEI: Try to divide those who  
10 want to shop or look at stores, that they can get  
11 on the access lane and they can slow down and look  
12 and park, and those who are going from, like I  
13 said, Congressional to West Montgomery, they can  
14 just keep going through the lights. Those who are  
15 stopping because there is a bus in the way  
16 (inaudible) and they go around them, those who --  
17 every 20, 30 feet there is a curb cut to get into  
18 a store, we want all those people to get on the  
19 side. Those who want to bike cannot be on the  
20 main road, and they can go on the side.

21 Really all this plan is doing is -- I  
22 was actually a little disappointed in the

1 beginning because I felt like there is really not  
2 too much traffic analysis in this plan. I think  
3 the reason is there is no traffic addition, there  
4 are no lanes. There's really no significant  
5 capacity, that's why the state, from the  
6 beginning, did not get into traffic analysis.

7 Like I said, all this plan is doing is  
8 just trying to divide people aside. The bikers  
9 will be on the bike track or the cycle track, cars  
10 will stay on the lane, those who want to slow down  
11 get on the access lane, pedestrians will have a  
12 wider space to walk on. By no means would this  
13 plan make Rockville Pike a highway.

14 We've seen some studies, and I'm not  
15 sure how accurate they are, but they are showing  
16 that the average speed on Rockville Pike would be  
17 6 miles per hour. It's not going to be 6, but  
18 it's not going to be 35. Because I hear sometimes  
19 concern that, oh, this will be a highway. It's  
20 not going to be a highway. It's congestion. We  
21 have several intersections there at (inaudible).

22 It's a part of (inaudible) now that

1     anybody who is developing, they have an  
2     (inaudible). They cannot add any extra traffic,  
3     so they cannot (inaudible) they cannot get  
4     redeveloped. Again, we are not increasing  
5     capacity, but those are the issues we are trying  
6     to make just a little bit safer and little bit  
7     more efficient.

8                    MAYOR NEWTON: Emad, I'm going to  
9     disagree with you. As somebody who drives  
10    Rockville Pike frequently, not everyday anymore,  
11    but enough to know that there are certain times  
12    that it's choked and there are certain times that  
13    it's a highway.

14                   If we do take all of the mitigating  
15    factors away and allow it to just be through in  
16    those center lanes, I believe it will continue to  
17    be even more so of a throughway because there  
18    won't be the slowdown for the turning or whatever.  
19    I will respectfully disagree with you.

20                   The other thing I want to ask is back to  
21    Councilmember Moore's question. In Chevy Chase on  
22    Connecticut Avenue, they now have speed cameras.

1 That's on Connecticut Avenue, which is a state  
2 road. In Bethesda -- I believe it's Bethesda, but  
3 it might be right in the district -- as you come  
4 from Bethesda downtown towards DC, towards  
5 Friendship Heights, there are speed cameras there  
6 as well on Wisconsin Avenue. Neither of them are  
7 near schools. How are they allowed to control the  
8 speed and we would not should we desire -- I'm not  
9 saying we do, but should we desire, why would we  
10 not be allowed to control the speed?

11 MR. ELSHAFEI: You're talking about  
12 speed cameras, not red light cameras, correct?

13 MAYOR NEWTON: Correct.

14 MR. ELSHAFEI: Again, at this point the  
15 police is really handling the speed cameras, and  
16 they have their process of how they get approved.  
17 But on state roads it has to be approved by the  
18 state. I'm not really sure what the process is at  
19 this point. I know for red light cameras they  
20 require several -- they have several things that  
21 have to be shown from the jurisdiction: Crashes,  
22 volume, citations, several things like this to be



1     able to approve the map. But for speed, I assume  
2     they would need some kind of documentation of how  
3     fast people go in this area.

4             MR. LEVY: Presumably, the speed cameras  
5     are measuring whether people are speeding above  
6     whatever the speed limit is.

7             MR. MOORE: It doesn't affect the limit  
8     itself.

9             MR. LEVY: Right. Whatever the limit  
10    is, you put the speed limit --

11            MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

12            MR. LEVY: -- to gauge whether people  
13    are breaking that law.

14            MAYOR NEWTON: Right. They've lowered  
15    the speed to 30.

16            MR. LEVY: Right.

17            MAYOR NEWTON: It's a drop. Anyway, my  
18    point is just that the state may have control of  
19    the road, but there's nothing that says we can't  
20    work with the state to change if that's what we  
21    want to do.

22            MR. MOORE: I guess my question is given

1 the width of the road and the intended role of  
2 this state highway in that part of Maryland, is  
3 there any realistic chance that if we ask the  
4 state for a lower -- significantly lower speed  
5 limit that they would give it to us?

6 MR. ELSHAFEI: There is always a chance,  
7 but we have to have a case of what is the issue.  
8 Then they would do an analysis, and they would  
9 decide if they do or not.

10 MAYOR NEWTON: Do you know what the  
11 speed limit is now at the White Flint area that  
12 they've just --

13 MR. MOORE: Thirty-five.

14 MAYOR NEWTON: What is it?

15 MR. MOORE: Thirty-five.

16 MAYOR NEWTON: It's 35.

17 MR. ELSHAFEI: But I want to get back to  
18 you on this point because I really rarely see that  
19 -- the rush hour everywhere is usually between  
20 4:00 and 7:00. It's easy always to pin down which  
21 hour is the worst, and it's usually 5:00 to 6:30.  
22 The problem with Rockville Pike sometimes is that

1 the rush hour is continuous. At lunchtime, I'm  
2 sure you know, it's starting to not move fast  
3 because everybody's going to lunch. Throughout  
4 the day, at least during the week, I know that  
5 traffic does not move fast on Rockville Pike. I'm  
6 sure at 2:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. people go fast.

7 MAYOR NEWTON: No, no, no. But there  
8 are other times during the day that it does. I  
9 will tell you that there is that chokepoint at  
10 Edmonston. There's always a chokepoint there.  
11 But sometimes once you get through there on either  
12 end, you're booking along.

13 It's really not the whole point to  
14 belabor tonight, but the fact of the matter is I  
15 have a strong concern about what we would be  
16 creating by making through lanes and access lanes.  
17 It's not just the build-to line and the ability of  
18 the city to decide what's more important for us in  
19 the vision that we have for the Pike, which I  
20 think we should be figuring that out. But it's  
21 what are we creating then in terms of the traffic  
22 on the Pike.

1 MR. ELSHAFEI: Option 2 showing here,  
2 you see already the existing access lanes. We  
3 know throughout the Pike now there are some areas  
4 that have access lanes or parking lots. I think  
5 what this plan is doing is organizing those access  
6 lanes because right now people move, stop, there  
7 are some stop signs, there's some traffic signals.  
8 I believe the plan is not going to move traffic  
9 faster or much faster.

10 MR. LEVY: Okay.

11 MS. KEBBA: Where they exist now,  
12 they're two-way, two-directional on each side.

13 MAYOR NEWTON: Exactly.

14 MR. ELSHAFEI: It's like a parking lot.

15 MS. KEBBA: That's actually more  
16 (inaudible), yeah.

17 MR. ELSHAFEI: They are not very  
18 efficient because it's like a parking lot. They  
19 stop at any point, there are stop signs, people  
20 are coming from any direction. They are not  
21 organized.

22 MR. LEVY: (inaudible) That's right.



1                   MAYOR NEWTON: I would like to see a  
2     bike lane on each side. That was the question  
3     Councilmember Feinberg brought up, and I think  
4     that would be important, to do a bike lane on each  
5     side.

6                   MR. ELSHAFEI: The current plan, the  
7     proposed one, is showing the access cycle track on  
8     both sides, which means two ways on both sides.

9                   MR. MOORE: Is the thought that as we  
10    get up the Pike that where the access lanes drop  
11    off, on the east side at least, that the cycle  
12    track would drop off at the same point? It would  
13    lose both at about the same point and roughly  
14    what's the intersection --

15                  MR. LEVY: The plan shows the access  
16    roads going to about half a block's distance north  
17    of Congressional Lane.

18                  MS. SWIFT: That's the Middle Pike and  
19    the North Pike. However, that's fine.

20                  MR. LEVY: Yeah, the --

21                  MR. MOORE: Is that about where Chapman  
22    would pop --

1 MR. LEVY: That's exactly where.

2 MR. MOORE: Okay.

3 MS. KEBBA: It's --

4 MR. LEVY: At that point, the properties  
5 start to get very narrow, the distance between the  
6 Pike and the railroad tracks.

7 MS. KEBBA: Yeah, it's the whole red  
8 area.

9 MR. MOORE: Okay. I guess my question  
10 then is on the west side, if we did access lanes  
11 all the way down, you've got 2 miles of access  
12 lanes. It's consistent. If you're driving down  
13 there, you know exactly how that's going to work  
14 because it's going to be the same regime all the  
15 way down. If you're coming north, how long a  
16 stretch of access lanes do you need for them to be  
17 useful? If it were just one block long, would  
18 that be helpful? If it's half a mile long, is  
19 that helpful? What's the thought on how much in  
20 the way of access lanes you need for them to  
21 actually serve a useful purpose? Because it's not  
22 the entire length, and it's not even -- I think

1 it's only about --

2 MAYOR NEWTON: About a third.

3 MR. MOORE: -- about a third or so.

4 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah.

5 MR. MOORE: Is the thought that's going  
6 to be enough for them to be helpful on that side  
7 of the road?

8 MS. KEBBA: I think there still is some  
9 place- making for that length of property. How  
10 much it does from a traffic standpoint, I'll let  
11 them answer that. But I think it does for that  
12 stretch. Part of the whole purpose of the access  
13 roads as it's written in the plan is a  
14 place-making feature.

15 MR. LEVY: In that portion of the Pike  
16 where it is, that's exactly where the worst  
17 intersections are. Halpine, Rollins, Twinbrook  
18 Parkway, Congressional Lane -- you can correct me  
19 if I'm wrong -- those are the intersections until  
20 you get all the way up to Edmonston.

21 The issue with the Pike, of course, is  
22 how difficult it is to go east-west because of the

1 railroad tracks. That's not a Pike issue; it's a  
2 railroad tracks issue. Any place where you can go  
3 east-west, the cars are going to collect.

4 In addition, those are the deepest sites  
5 in terms of from the road to the railroad tracks,  
6 and so there's more intensity of development, and  
7 Montrose is coming through and sending a lot of  
8 traffic. There's a lot of stuff going in that  
9 area, and so those intersections are, depending on  
10 the time of day, at E's and F's and -- is that  
11 right?

12 I would agree with the Mayor's comment  
13 that depending on where you are and when you are,  
14 you can move. But it's when you get past that  
15 stuff. You've got to get past Congressional  
16 before you can start to move, and then you can  
17 move a while, and then it starts to back up again  
18 when you start to get to the intersections. But  
19 there where the access road is on the east side,  
20 that's where it's toughest and that's where, from  
21 the traffic point-of-view, it might alleviate some  
22 of the through and local.



1 MR. MOORE: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. LEVY: Emad can slap me around if I  
3 got that --

4 MR. MOORE: Do you want a decision on  
5 this?

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Sure. (Laughter) I would  
7 rather not have decisions until we get with the  
8 Planning Commission. I almost think we should  
9 have had the Planning Commission work session with  
10 us first so that we actually work with them, talk  
11 with them about their reasoning and whatnot, and  
12 then come back to the Mayor and Council to make  
13 our final thoughts, but we're backwards.

14 MR. LEVY: Okay.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: I don't know that we're  
16 ready to make decisions.

17 MR. MOORE: I think in some ways it  
18 would be helpful for us to get some preliminary  
19 straw votes on some of these things so we will  
20 have an organized presentation to take to the  
21 Planning Commission and say, if you think we're  
22 wrong on any of these things, tell us where we're

1 wrong.

2 MAYOR NEWTON: The Planning Commission  
3 is a work session, so everybody should feel free  
4 to have their own comments then as well, and I  
5 don't think we need to be --

6 MR. MOORE: On the draft that they've  
7 given us, they've organized their thoughts.  
8 They're like, here is our vision of what it should  
9 look like. It'd probably be helpful for us to  
10 show up and say, all right, here's the early  
11 version of what we think it should look like. Now  
12 let's mesh them together.

13 MS. SWIFT: I was just going to make a  
14 suggestion that if there are things that we could  
15 eliminate, features or options, and really what we  
16 were trying to do with the features is to have you  
17 look at what your preferences were on the  
18 features. Then we could come back, and if it  
19 doesn't fit into one of the cross sections that  
20 we've already come up with, then we could try to  
21 create a new option that met your features or your  
22 preferences.

1           If there's a way to do that -- again, no  
2       decisions, and if you have no opinion or no  
3       preference that's fine too. But if there are some  
4       preferences, then we could try to formulate in our  
5       back room that -- we actually have engineers and  
6       planners speaking to each other's topics here, so  
7       we've collaborated a lot. We could try to do that  
8       and/or if there are either options or features  
9       that we can eliminate, then I think you'd just  
10      have a smaller group of topics to talk through  
11      with the Planning Commission and you could just  
12      get more quality time on those.

13           MAYOR NEWTON: Sure. Remind me a bike  
14      lane is 10 feet?

15           MR. LEVY: Yeah, right. We --

16           MR. ELSHAFEI: The cycle track is 10  
17      feet. The cycle track showing on this plan is 10  
18      feet, but a bike lane is 5 feet usually. It can  
19      be 6, but most of the proposed here the bike lane  
20      is 5, the cycle track is 10.

21           MAYOR NEWTON: A cycle track means two  
22      lanes, two directions?

1 MR. ELSHAFEI: Correct, two directions.

2 MS. SWIFT: A bike lane is not separated  
3 from the traffic lane, and a cycle track is  
4 actually just cyclists.

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Is it possible to  
6 separate a 5-foot bike lane from the roadway but  
7 not have -- my thought right now is that we  
8 probably don't have enough bikes to justify cycle  
9 tracks on both sides, but we definitely have  
10 enough bikes to justify a path. Then if there are  
11 times that they're passing each other, it's not as  
12 much -- that's what I'm thinking now.

13 I'm also not trying to make this a big,  
14 wide road, but I definitely think bikes should be  
15 separated from car traffic. Can you do that with  
16 a 5 foot as opposed to a 10 foot?

17 MR. LEVY: If it's declared as one-way  
18 on each side. Now, bikes will do what they do --

19 MAYOR NEWTON: No, no, no. Not one-way.  
20 I'm not saying one-way. I'm saying let it be both  
21 ways, but don't build a cycle track. I don't know  
22 that we need to have 10 feet set aside.



1 MR. MOORE: What would you have instead?

2 MAYOR NEWTON: I'd have 5 feet set aside  
3 on each side, and they could go --

4 MS. SWIFT: For two-way?

5 MAYOR NEWTON: -- two-way on either side  
6 because I don't think we have as much traffic.

7 We're not the Crescent Trail, and we don't have as  
8 much traffic as they do there. What is the  
9 Crescent Trail? It's probably 10 or 15 feet?

10 MR. LEVY: That's super wide.

11 MAYOR NEWTON: It's not as wide as you  
12 would think, especially when you get roller  
13 bladers on.

14 MS. KEBBA: We do show some as 8 feet.

15 MR. LEVY: And walkers.

16 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, and walkers.

17 MS. KEBBA: On Option 6 they're 8-feet  
18 wide because they're fully protected.

19 MAYOR NEWTON: Uh-huh.

20 MS. KEBBA: For two-way I think 8 feet  
21 works. Five feet I --

22 MAYOR NEWTON: Might be too narrow?

1 Eight feet's possible.

2 MR. MOORE: One thing I'm struck by  
3 though is it's almost like saying, how many  
4 pedestrians do we have on the Pike right now?  
5 Let's build this for the number of pedestrians  
6 that we see walking up and down the Pike. We  
7 don't see very many pedestrians walking up and  
8 down the Pike because it's a terrible place to  
9 walk, and we don't see very many bicyclists  
10 because it's a terrible place to bike.

11 We like to go to the bike store and near  
12 the Taco Bell, and we're taking our life in our  
13 hands to bike to the bike store. If there were  
14 lanes up and down the side, I think you would see  
15 exponentially more bicyclists in those stretches.

16 MS. KEBBA: Yeah, I think if you --

17 MAYOR NEWTON: I am talking about  
18 putting one on each side.

19 MR. MOORE: No, but you were saying you  
20 don't see that there's enough demand right now  
21 because we're not the Crescent Trail. I think if  
22 we had serious bike lanes as much as we could on

1 both sides that you would see an enormous amount  
2 of traffic on those.

3 MS. CARR: I think that's exactly the  
4 experience that DC has had --

5 MR. MOORE: Right.

6 MS. CARR: -- since the bidirectional  
7 cycle tracks have gone in downtown.

8 MR. MOORE: L Street and -- yeah.

9 MS. CARR: I've walked past through  
10 those every day on the way to my office, and I can  
11 recall before the cycle tracks were there you'd  
12 see some bicyclists, but in the mornings you would  
13 see pileups at the light of 10 people waiting for  
14 the light to change who were riding through the  
15 cycle tracks on any given light cycle. I think  
16 the demand will be there in the future when we  
17 provide a safe --

18 MR. MOORE: If you build it.

19 MS. CARR: Yeah.

20 MAYOR NEWTON: Ten feet on each side?

21 MR. ELSHAFEI: If you look at Option 7,  
22 I think that's what you were alluding to. Option

1 7 is showing a 5- foot bike lane and a 2-feet  
2 buffer and then the parking lane.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: Mm-hmm.

4 MR. ELSHAFEI: This may be an option  
5 that you can consider.

6 MAYOR NEWTON: I'll go to 10. It's  
7 certainly not --

8 MR. ELSHAFEI: (Laughter) Consider the  
9 option.

10 MAYOR NEWTON: I definitely want to see  
11 us have the space and be safe, so that's what it  
12 is.

13 MR. LEVY: That was question five, which  
14 is on the back magically. Should they be included  
15 as part of the access road as in the Planning  
16 Commission draft, and this actually said one-way 5  
17 or two-way 8 minimum, but it's 10 in the draft.  
18 Then there are the other options here. I don't  
19 know, as per what Susan was saying, if that's one  
20 of the things that you feel like you don't need to  
21 discuss with the Planning Commission because  
22 you're with them or you want to raise it.



1 MS. SWIFT: I guess what I was saying is  
2 that they can discuss it with the Planning  
3 Commission, but at least you've narrowed down the  
4 options on the bikeway as to what you're leaning  
5 toward. We can incorporate those and show them  
6 what that would look like.

7 MR. LEVY: Sure, but if they endorse  
8 what the Planning Commission's recommending --

9 MS. SWIFT: Sure.

10 MR. LEVY: -- then perhaps you're done.

11 MAYOR NEWTON: I think one of the  
12 concerns is -- because I feel strongly about the  
13 access roads. What I heard from a couple of  
14 planning commissioners that I spoke to is they  
15 didn't even have a discussion about not having  
16 access roads.

17 MS. KEBBA: That's true.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: To limit ourselves right  
19 now to go with the Planning Commission draft when  
20 we haven't had that discussion about no access  
21 roads, I mean, why limit it?

22 MR. LEVY: No, that's fine. I was just

1 talking about bikes, but that's fine.

2 MAYOR NEWTON: But see, bikes is part of  
3 the access road.

4 MR. LEVY: That's fine.

5 MR. MOORE: Should we start at number  
6 one, then? Can we do some straw votes starting at  
7 number one?

8 MAYOR NEWTON: Sure. How do you all  
9 feel about Bus Rapid Transit? Should Bus Rapid  
10 Transit be a feature of the Rockville Pike Plan?  
11 If yes, where should it be located? If no, are  
12 there alternative transit options? Councilmember  
13 Onley?

14 MS. ONLEY: I think it should be because  
15 I think we're becoming a society where people want  
16 public transportation, so it definitely should be  
17 a part. I think down the middle seems to be the  
18 best option from what I've read and what people  
19 have explained.

20 MR. MOORE: Yeah.

21 MS. ONLEY: Okay. That's my two cents,  
22 that's my straw vote.

1 MS. CARR: I have to agree with  
2 Councilmember Onley, and given the county's plans,  
3 I think it's probably most prudent for the city to  
4 take that (inaudible).

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay. Councilmember  
6 Moore?

7 MR. MOORE: Yeah. I was excited that we  
8 could pick up a couple feet on each side if we did  
9 them down the sides, but I'm compelled by the  
10 arguments of our Public Works folks that it's just  
11 less safe. One of the things that we really want  
12 to build into this as much as we can is to make  
13 this as safe as possible for the people who are  
14 going to be using this. I guess it's A --

15 MAYOR NEWTON: Is your vote.  
16 Councilmember Feinberg?

17 MS. FEINBERG: Yeah, I'm fine with that.  
18 I too had originally was really savoring on Option  
19 4 because it was 244 feet, if I remember that's  
20 what he had said, if I have that correctly, as  
21 opposed to the 252. But hearing everything, I'm  
22 going to have to go with Option 3.

1                   MAYOR NEWTON: Option 3, okay. We're  
2           just doing BRT.

3                   MS. FEINBERG: I'm sorry.

4                   MR. LEVY: You mean BRT in the center?

5                   MS. FEINBERG: I'm looking at the map.

6                   MR. SIMONEAU: Oh, okay.

7                   MS. FEINBERG: Okay. You're looking at  
8           your --

9                   MAYOR NEWTON: I'm going to go along  
10          with BRT lanes in the middle, and I'm just going  
11          to hope it's not a BRT. (Laughter)

12                   MR. LEVY: If I might say that the  
13          decision to the extent it is one is simply that  
14          the plan will incorporate dedicated lanes for  
15          transit --

16                   MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

17                   MR. LEVY: -- and that there will be a  
18          width because that's how we start to measure where  
19          the buildings will be ultimately.

20                   MAYOR NEWTON: Exactly.

21                   MR. LEVY: It doesn't have to be a yes  
22          or no on BRT, but it is space.



1 MS. ONLEY: I'm going to add something  
2 else.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: Councilmember Onley?

4 MS. ONLEY: I was in Bethesda and  
5 actually waiting for my car to be serviced, and I  
6 was deciding where I was going to go when I met a  
7 friend. We looked up, and we thought, okay, we're  
8 only going to go where we can walk. We looked up,  
9 and around the corner came the Bethesda --

10 MAYOR NEWTON: Circulator?

11 MS. ONLEY: Yes, and I was like, we need  
12 this in Rockville.

13 MAYOR NEWTON: We do.

14 MS. ONLEY: When you said 'hope it's not  
15 a BRT,' we could start with something like that.  
16 That would be great, I think.

17 MAYOR NEWTON: I was just staring at  
18 Emad because he knows that I'm waiting for a  
19 little bit of information to get to all of you  
20 about that, so, yeah.

21 MS. ONLEY: Oh.

22 MR. ELSHAFEI: It's coming.

1 MAYOR NEWTON: Thank you.

2 MS. ONLEY: Good news.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: Christmas is too.

4 MR. LEVY: I would propose that we skip  
5 2, the access roads --

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay.

7 MR. LEVY: -- because we know -- unless  
8 you want to continue. I see eyebrows. Go for it.

9 MR. MOORE: This doesn't commit us to  
10 anything.

11 MR. LEVY: Go for it.

12 MR. MOORE: I am keeping an open mind on  
13 it, and I know we're going to be lobbied hard on  
14 this probably more than any other point between  
15 now and the time this thing finally gets passed.  
16 But at the moment I'm leaning toward formalizing  
17 them as they are in the plan. But again, that  
18 would not be a set decision.

19 MAYOR NEWTON: Councilmember Feinberg?

20 MS. FEINBERG: I would echo that.

21 That's exactly what I was going to say, to  
22 formalize it. After listening to the folks on the

1 other side of the table, it sounds like a safety  
2 issue.

3 MAYOR NEWTON: Anybody else?

4 MS. ONLEY: Actually, I would like them  
5 formalized, but I would like them formalized in  
6 some areas. I can drive you down the Pike and  
7 say, okay, here I want it formalized, here I  
8 don't. I'm sorry, but that's my opinion. I do  
9 think that in some instances, in some cases, in  
10 some areas on the Pike we do need some  
11 formalization, but in some instances I say let's  
12 can them. Let's not formalize. I'm torn, I  
13 guess. That's my two cents.

14 MS. CARR: I'll just say I've not yet  
15 made up my mind on this one. I can see the pros  
16 and cons for formalizing it. I haven't ruled it  
17 out, but I'm not quite there yet either.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: Let's wait and talk with  
19 the Planning Commission and see what we can --

20 MR. MOORE: All right. Mm-hmm.

21 MS. ONLEY: That sounds great.

22 MAYOR NEWTON: -- come to. Okay.

1 MR. LEVY: Sidewalks.

2 MAYOR NEWTON: Oh yeah, sidewalks.

3 MR. LEVY: We were exploring ways to  
4 narrow because of the width. Just to be clear why  
5 this is here, in the Planning Commission draft  
6 they are 20 feet in the sense that the clear space  
7 is 10 feet and the amenity zone is 10 feet.  
8 That's 20. If we're looking to narrow the Pike,  
9 that's an option. You can make it narrower. The  
10 option that we have that's narrowest that might  
11 meet needs is 15 feet. To be clear, we're  
12 attempting to be neutral on these things, but on  
13 this one we do recommend the 20.

14 MR. MOORE: Okay. (Laughter)

15 MAYOR NEWTON: I'll just say that --

16 MR. LEVY: Did I say that right, Craig?

17 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah.

18 MR. SIMONEAU: Yes. (Laughter)

19 MAYOR NEWTON: I think when we're  
20 talking about narrowing the Pike, we don't take it  
21 away from pedestrian and amenities. If we want  
22 the experience there to be terrific -- and I'll



1 tell you the difference in Town Square in front of  
2 Gordon Biersch and then on the new Duball property  
3 along Middle Lane is unbelievable. I know their  
4 sidewalk isn't built yet, but that's going to be  
5 not fun to walk along there because you're not  
6 going to have even a little grass strip between  
7 the sidewalk and the street. I would definitely  
8 support the 20.

9 MR. MOORE: What is it at Gordon  
10 Biersch? What's the --

11 MAYOR NEWTON: It's only eight --

12 MS. SWIFT: Fifteen if you count the --  
13 I don't know at Gordon Biersch.

14 MR. MOORE: From building to the curb,  
15 what's the --

16 MS. SWIFT: Right. I think in Town  
17 Square it's pretty much 8 and 7, right?

18 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, that's --

19 MR. MOORE: That's tight, yeah.

20 MR. LEVY: At Gordon Biersch in  
21 particular it's tough --

22 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah.

1 MR. LEVY: -- because it actually rounds  
2 at the corner, and it's --

3 MR. SIMONEAU: What we find is when you  
4 don't go to 20, if you put outdoor seating --

5 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah.

6 MR. SIMONEAU: -- if you've noticed,  
7 Mayor, they're really encroaching on where they  
8 shouldn't be.

9 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

10 MR. SIMONEAU: But then if they had to  
11 fit it where they were supposed to, it's very  
12 difficult. What we find is in these more urban  
13 areas, the street furniture desires are increased:  
14 The bike racks, the lighting, everything just  
15 increases. You have parking meters; you have all  
16 this other stuff, and it's just -- the tree pits  
17 end up getting smaller, and you're trying to put  
18 20 pounds in a 15-pound bag, and it just doesn't  
19 all work.

20 You end up narrowing the pedestrian way  
21 a little bit, you end up really having to scrunch  
22 seating area, and you end up putting some of the

1 street furniture in odd places, and the street  
2 trees don't look as good. We think 20 feet gets  
3 you everything in a good fashion and fits it all.

4 MAYOR NEWTON: I agree. What do you all  
5 --

6 MS. ONLEY: I agree.

7 MS. CARR: Mm-hmm.

8 MS. ONLEY: Yes.

9 MAYOR NEWTON: Right. I see all nodding.  
10 On street parking?

11 MR. LEVY: Yeah, it's a tricky one  
12 because it depends on where we're talking about,  
13 right?

14 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

15 MR. LEVY: There's the 'if there's  
16 access road' and 'if there's not access road'.  
17 I'm going to do one that sounds easy first, which  
18 is if there's not access road -- we're just  
19 talking the Pike. We're not talking about the  
20 other cross streets.

21 MAYOR NEWTON: Right.

22 MR. LEVY: We've not decided on access

1 roads, but if there's not access road would you  
2 want parking on the Pike even if you managed to  
3 convince the state to slow it down?

4 MAYOR NEWTON: I think right now I  
5 wouldn't.

6 MS. ONLEY: I wouldn't, no.

7 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, I'm concerned about  
8 the safety.

9 MS. ONLEY: Yes.

10 MAYOR NEWTON: Exactly.

11 MS. ONLEY: No.

12 MR. LEVY: How about as --

13 MR. MOORE: How about we would do it as  
14 part of the access road if there are access roads?  
15 Would that be --

16 MR. LEVY: If not access roads, parallel  
17 parking directly on the Pike, I didn't see any  
18 nods.

19 MAYOR NEWTON: No, you're right.

20 MR. LEVY: We won't bring you any  
21 options that have that.

22 MR. MOORE: We don't want that blood on



1       our hands.

2                   MAYOR NEWTON:   Yeah.

3                   MR. LEVY:   If there are access roads,  
4       you can decide whether you want it or not.   That  
5       was, as we said, a significant conversation with  
6       the Planning Commission.   I don't know if you have  
7       a preference or do you just want to punt on that  
8       for now?

9                   MAYOR NEWTON:   Let's punt.   Yeah, let's  
10       have the conversation with the Planning Commission  
11       about the access roads, and then we can make a  
12       decision about --

13                  MR. LEVY:   All right.

14                  MAYOR NEWTON:   Yeah, okay.

15                  MR. LEVY:   Bike lanes or cycle tracks,  
16       that was one of the conversations that --

17                  MAYOR NEWTON:   I think we were pretty  
18       much going to cycle tracks, right?   Didn't we --

19                  MS. FEINBERG:   Yeah.

20                  MS. ONLEY:   Yes.

21                  MS. CARR:   I think what's currently in  
22       the plan is --

1 MR. MOORE: One possibility is  
2 (inaudible) southern part -- I'm just trying to  
3 think of a little bit of width we could save on  
4 the east side. From the southern part of the area  
5 all the way up to Chapman, if that were the cycle  
6 track -- and I don't know how you get a bike up  
7 and down that side of Rockville Pike. There's got  
8 to be some way to figure that out. If that could  
9 serve as the bicycle infrastructure because one of  
10 the attractive things about is even if you did the  
11 cycle track on Rockville Pike, it ends at Chapman  
12 or where Chapman pops out, I guess.

13 MR. LEVY: Correct, correct.

14 MR. MOORE: When Chapman turns the  
15 corner, is it still Chapman when it hits the Pike?  
16 Is that the thought?

17 MR. LEVY: We haven't gone through the  
18 street name process on that one.

19 MR. SIMONEAU: Yes. Yes, it is.

20 MR. MOORE: Okay. Yeah. See, Craig's  
21 got it.

22 MR. LEVY: Yes. The man says yes.

1 MR. SIMONEAU: That's already in the  
2 plan.

3 MR. LEVY: He's the director. He says  
4 yes.

5 MR. MOORE: Basically if you put it on  
6 Chapman or if you put it on the Pike, it ends in  
7 the same place. You do have the opportunity to  
8 pull it in a little bit and still get the same  
9 kind of activity that you would have had. That  
10 might be something worth looking at.

11 MS. KEBBA: Yeah, we thought about that  
12 too.

13 (inaudible) just using Chapman for  
14 bike infrastructure, whatever it  
15 shares with traffic, because it's a  
16 slow-moving road anyway, and then  
17 really having the cycle track on  
18 the west side; is that what you  
19 mean?

20 MR. MOORE: Right.

21 MS. KEBBA: Right.

22 MR. LEVY: Then if it's an access road,

1 putting a sign. That was one of the options you  
2 saw and that was a very active internal debate,  
3 frankly, about whether that's a good option. We  
4 put it forward for you, but --

5 MR. MOORE: I would say unless the  
6 Chapman thing would work really well, unless the  
7 (inaudible) thinks, okay, this is something we can  
8 really get behind. It'll be safe and be useful.  
9 Otherwise, I'd say just put them on the Pike. But  
10 that struck me as the one place where we could  
11 pull it in just a little bit and not lose all the  
12 functionality that we would lose if we pulled the  
13 access lanes (inaudible) something like that.

14 MR. LEVY: It's the spot of the most  
15 development demand. It's the sites where there's  
16 most action, so that was in the spirit of  
17 narrowing. It was a consideration.

18 MR. MOORE: Okay.

19 MR. LEVY: Okay. Right now, 4 out of 5  
20 say keep the 10, 1 is considering, and that's  
21 where we are. That was our Pike agenda for today  
22 in terms of the cross section itself. Obviously



1     because you haven't made a decision, which is  
2     fine, about the access roads, you can't make a  
3     decision about the cross section, and I think you  
4     don't want to until you talk with the Planning  
5     Commission. Unless anybody else has something  
6     they want to talk about for the cross section, we  
7     can move on.

8                   MAYOR NEWTON: Are we moving on to  
9     building heights?

10                  MR. MOORE: Actually --

11                  MR. LEVY: Mm-hmm.

12                  MAYOR NEWTON: I do have something, and  
13     I don't know where it should go, but I think one  
14     of the things that we want to be careful to  
15     encourage is home-grown businesses, our local  
16     businesses, our neighborhood businesses. At some  
17     point, we have to understand the relationship  
18     between the property owners and the developers and  
19     what we, as a community, want.

20                  We don't have to go there tonight, but I  
21     think if we want to encourage what everybody in  
22     Rockville says they want, which are local

1 businesses to be part of the conversation, then  
2 we've got to be able to give incentives to or  
3 requirements of those developers. I don't know  
4 whether we come at it like the (inaudible) or we  
5 have a requirement that a certain percentage has  
6 to be or whatever. I'm just throwing it out there  
7 that I think we have to have some sort of a  
8 conversation because it hasn't worked in Town  
9 Square like we thought it would. I just throw it  
10 out there for -- I don't know if it's in this  
11 conversation or the next, but --

12 MR. LEVY: We certainly have future work  
13 sessions for topics as you wish. We'll keep track  
14 of that.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay. Councilmember  
16 Moore?

17 MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madame Mayor. I  
18 have a question that bridges the two between the  
19 cross section and the heights that we're about to  
20 move to.

21 In the staff's analysis, if somebody  
22 comes to us and says, look, we would like a wider

1 space to build on, and we would like higher  
2 heights. If we're looking at the same, like --  
3 okay, the city's interest might be one or the  
4 other, but not both, which one is more valuable?  
5 If the builder wants to put (inaudible) on a  
6 particular place, does it hurt them more to pull  
7 it in or does it hurt them more to keep it short?

8 One of the ways I thought about this is  
9 if we can give height, then maybe it doesn't  
10 matter so much that we have a wider cross section  
11 than some folks would like. When you ask them  
12 about that they say, we would like both. Does the  
13 staff have a feel for that?

14 MR. LEVY: I'm going to dodge it just a  
15 hair, but what I would say is that we present  
16 these -- I'm glad that you talked about the  
17 interaction with them between the heights and the  
18 infrastructure. If this plan is about anything,  
19 it's about the interaction between land use and  
20 the infrastructure. It's how do the roads and the  
21 bike tracks and the bikeways and the sidewalks  
22 interact with the things that people are going to

1 use it for and what the buildings are.

2 We absolutely see the interaction  
3 between the two. I think we should think about  
4 both of them together. We've always worked with  
5 the work session because each topic is it's own  
6 deep dive.

7 MR. MOORE: Mm-hmm.

8 MR. LEVY: It's hard, but then  
9 ultimately you do have to back up and say, all  
10 right, what's the thing we built, and is it going  
11 to be the thing that you have envisioned?

12 MAYOR NEWTON: That's why I don't think  
13 they could be taken in silos, as you're saying.

14 MR. LEVY: Yeah, yeah.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: You have to deal with the  
16 competing priorities, which takes precedent.

17 MR. LEVY: Right, and --

18 MS. KEBBA: I think it's where you are  
19 on how much Pike frontage you have. Each  
20 property's different that way. If you have a  
21 mathematical equation, we could figure out by site  
22 which is more valuable, but it's going to vary.



1                   You could build up to 8 stories on 1.5  
2    acres, for example, that this all -- property has  
3    an access road. You could build the other 17  
4    acres -- additional height that you might get from  
5    adding more building height. You just have to do  
6    that calculation. If you only have a small bit of  
7    frontage on the Pike, it's going to be less of an  
8    issue.

9                   MR. LEVY: Right, gotcha. Okay.  
10   Assuming a square in which one of the even sides  
11   is facing the Pike, the difference between -- take  
12   residential development. If you limit it to  
13   anything between 6 and 11 stories, you're going to  
14   get a 5-story building because of building  
15   technology, a 5 or maybe 6 stories.

16                   Although technology changes, there's new  
17   things going on that maybe will allow this area  
18   that is not built in typically. But the  
19   difference in amount of buildable space between 5  
20   or even 6 stories and 12 stories or 13, what was  
21   approved on the Twinbrook Metro place, on a square  
22   site would be more than what you would lose with

1 the access roads. That's quantity. You did some  
2 calculations on that?

3 MS. KEBBA: I did, yeah.

4 MR. MOORE: Does that take into account  
5 what it costs per square foot to build a building  
6 like that? I know that a concrete building is  
7 expensive to build. It's much more per square  
8 foot than a stick-built building.

9 MS. KEBBA: Right.

10 MR. MOORE: Is that the question you  
11 get?

12 MS. KEBBA: You can do crunching on the  
13 lower building. If you built that and took it out  
14 onto the access road or the -- there are many  
15 variables. There are a lot of variables we could  
16 do, run a few scenarios for you, but it just  
17 depends.

18 MR. LEVY: But you did just how much  
19 building square footage; isn't that what you did  
20 mostly or --

21 MS. KEBBA: Right.

22 MR. LEVY: -- an estimate of --

1 MS. KEBBA: Depends on the number of  
2 stories.

3 MR. LEVY: Right.

4 MS. KEBBA: On the access road you can  
5 be going from zero to whatever the maximum is, and  
6 if you're adding building height to what you're  
7 already allowed, you're getting that difference.

8 MR. LEVY: Okay. Thank you. Thanks.

9 MS. KEBBA: Yeah, we can run some stuff.

10 MR. LEVY: Do you want to keep going or

11 --

12 MAYOR NEWTON: Sure.

13 MR. LEVY: Okay. Give us just a second  
14 to switch themes. If you want to stand up and --

15 MAYOR NEWTON: I'm hearing a little bit  
16 of -- we're tired. Monday night was another  
17 really long night, and I think at end of the week  
18 -- I'm wondering if we're going to really mess you  
19 guys up if we just (inaudible) this next  
20 conversation to the next group session.

21 MR. LEVY: It's your call. We're happy  
22 to go. Some of us were here last night too, but

1 we have stamina, and we're ready to go. It's  
2 whatever you want to do. We're ready to go for  
3 the next one, but it's your call.

4 MS. ONLEY: I think we should stop.  
5 That's my two cents.

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Councilmember Moore?

7 MR. MOORE: I will (inaudible).

8 MS. FEINBERG: I think we should stop  
9 too. Especially staff has been here (inaudible).

10 MR. LEVY: Oh, I shouldn't have said it.

11 (Laughter)

12 MS. FEINBERG: Monday night was  
13 (inaudible) for staff also.

14 MS. ONLEY: Yeah, exactly.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: I think this has been  
16 great. It's been wonderful.

17 MS. ONLEY: It has been.

18 MAYOR NEWTON: It's been 2.5 hours of  
19 good discussion. Maybe end on a high note, right?  
20 (Laughter) And it's your birthday. (Laughter)

21 MR. MOORE: I agree.

22 MAYOR NEWTON: Go home and celebrate



1 with --

2 MR. LEVY: You whispered it to me too.

3 MR. SIMONEAU: (inaudible)

4 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, go home and  
5 celebrate with your family.

6 I thank everybody very much. I think  
7 this was good, and we'll continue, and maybe we'll  
8 add the height conversation to the Planning  
9 Commission discussion because actually there's a  
10 lot of stuff there we can work on.

11 MR. LEVY: At risk of saying something  
12 that's not authorized by either of the level of  
13 bosses, I think there's been value of having a  
14 dedicated meeting on this topic.

15 MS. ONLEY: Yes.

16 MAYOR NEWTON: Absolutely.

17 MS. ONLEY: I agree.

18 MR. LEVY: If the Mayor and Council are  
19 willing to carve out -- and we can keep it to  
20 where we promise each other we won't go until late  
21 at night, that we've got a shot at making progress  
22 on stuff. I would encourage you to consider it.

1 MAYOR NEWTON: I would agree.

2 MS. ONLEY: Yes, I agree as well.

3 MS. KEBBA: On the 23rd, which is a week  
4 from Monday, we have about an hour for work  
5 sessions, so we'll put heights on as the topic?

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, we'll move it then.

7 MR. MOORE: What was there?

8 MS. KEBBA: Nothing yet because we were  
9 going to wait to see where we got here.

10 (Laughter)

11 MAYOR NEWTON: Do you know what we could  
12 do? Here's an idea, and I know Barb said today  
13 that the 23rd was a packed agenda.

14 MS. ONLEY: Mm-hmm.

15 MAYOR NEWTON: We could take the work  
16 session off the 23rd and put it on with the  
17 Planning Commission. Isn't that the --

18 MS. KEBBA: That's the 25th.

19 MAYOR NEWTON: -- 25th?

20 MS. KEBBA: Two days later.

21 MAYOR NEWTON: Yeah, two days later and  
22 just have a thorough discussion with everybody.

1 MS. KEBBA: Unless you just want to  
2 spend an hour or 45 minutes talking about heights  
3 before your meeting with the Planning Commission  
4 if you want.

5 MS. FEINBERG: Would you like to do  
6 that?

7 MR. LEVY: Yeah.

8 MS. FEINBERG: I think I'd like to  
9 because what you're sharing is your professional  
10 expertise, and we're valuing from your exchange  
11 and your knowledge. I'd like to do that. That's  
12 fine.

13 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay. Then we'll keep it  
14 on.

15 MS. KEBBA: We'll just keep it short,  
16 but stick to that one topic.

17 MR. LEVY: You'll probably want to  
18 reserve a little bit of that time to decide what  
19 and how you want to discuss with the Planning  
20 Commission at your discretion.

21 MAYOR NEWTON: Okay, okay. Super.

22 MR. LEVY: Great.

1 MAYOR NEWTON: All right. Thanks,  
2 everybody.

3 MS. FEINBERG: Thank you.

4 MS. ONLEY: Thank you.

5 MS. CARR: Thank you for the cupcakes.

6 MAYOR NEWTON: Oh, you're welcome.

7 MS. FEINBERG: Oh, Bridget. We need a  
8 motion to end. That's what she just --

9 MAYOR NEWTON: Oh. I move that we  
10 adjourn.

11 MS. FEINBERG: I'll second.

12 (Whereupon, the HEARING was  
13 adjourned.)

14 \* \* \* \* \*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22



## 1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

2 I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby  
3 certify that the forgoing electronic file when  
4 originally transmitted was reduced to text at my  
5 direction; that said transcript is a true record  
6 of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am  
7 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by  
8 any of the parties to the action in which these  
9 proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I  
10 am neither a relative or employee of any attorney  
11 or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor  
12 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome  
13 of this action.

14 /s/Carleton J. Anderson, III  
15  
16

17 Notary Public in and for the  
18 Commonwealth of Virginia  
19 Commission No. 351998  
20 Expires: November 30, 2016  
21  
22